SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

16th A.D.
8th S.D.
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
OCT 22 1986
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (If applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

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

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/16

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

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

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 4
Educator
Educadora 教育家

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

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 8
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 10
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 16
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

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

MIKE CURB, Republican 20

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

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 24
Author
Autora 作家

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 28
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 30
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 32
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 34
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 36
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 42
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 44
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 46
Retired Electrical Director
Director Electrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 48
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 50
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

3 Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	53
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	55
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註冊公共會計師	56
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長 Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	63
ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	64
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	66
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	67
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

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

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	74
CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	75
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員
United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 81
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 83
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 85
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 87
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 89
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員
United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SALA BURTON, Democratic 96
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 98
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 100

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 102
Worker
Trabajador 工人

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/16-S

5 State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参議員

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

STATE SENATOR

RUSSELL GRAY, Republican Independent Businessman Hombre de Negocios Independiente 独立商人	105 ➡
QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado 市参議員	107 ➡
LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic Member of the Legislature Miembro de la Legislatura 議員	109 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	111 ➡

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

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

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom Child Care Teacher Maestra de Guarderia Infantil 托兒所教師	115 ➡
MAX WOODS, Republican Cable Car Gripman Fijador de Tranvias con Cables 纜車司機	117 ➡
ART AGNOS, Democratic State Assemblyman Asambleista Estatal 州衆議員	119 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	121 ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 ➡ NO 133 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 ➡ NO 136 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 ➡ NO 139 ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 ➡ NO 142 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 ➡ NO 145 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 ➡ NO 148 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 ➡ NO 151 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 ➡ NO 154 ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

CITY & COUNTY
(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/16

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多 5 人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	185
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	186
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	187
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	188
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advoçate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	189
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	190
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	191
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	192
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	193
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	194
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	195
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	196
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	197
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	198
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	199
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	200
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	201
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	202
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	203
(WRITE-IN) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	210
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	211
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	212
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación 舊金山教育局主席	213
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	214
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	215
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	216
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員	217
SODONIA WILSON Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管	218

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	222
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	224
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董	225
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師	226
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	227

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

9/16-O

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de los terrenos públicos. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍購買合約法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作爲興建或興修公校之資金開支，每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年興建新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），撥供資金用於購買和興建青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），撥供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），撥供資金用於加州的公共高等教育機構興建或修繕。包括加州大學的九個校園，加州州立大學的十九個校園，加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州商船學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $480,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法性官員人員之退休福利。廢止憲法規定現任官員的退休福利應根據繼任者的薪俸決定其退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不超二十個人的退休福利根據照加。美州節省開支$480,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

親戚、家庭財產轉讓。免去配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實竟註冊新估值，財政影響，將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失三千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年將失三千七百萬元。收益以後年度增加，州政府的損將減低將地方上的損失。州州省局會將承擔上述收額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉產出。財政影響，對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan *mantener* el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes pertinentes en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

搬屋、舊代新生。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持住宅的估值。財政影響，除非州議會同時法例以實施本法案，否則從對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。假如州議會同通過本提案的話，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘部份。州政府將由普通基金撥出援助金補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共事員、承包人之酬勞。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別承包人之酬勞。財政影響，假若州政府將未知。本提案將為州及地方政府節省將來的開費，估計州及地方第一年可省開資約一億二千五百萬元，但開資的開費可能因必須補償政府開設和休假假期的七十億元而抵銷。支出預算可能超出開資節約。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 →
NO 262 →

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 →
NO 264 →

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 →
NO 267 →

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 →
NO 270 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 →
NO 274 →

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 →
NO 277 →

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

YES 279 →
NO 280 →

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

YES 282 →
NO 283 →

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

YES 285 →
NO 286 →

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan los dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1986. Las previsiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方稅收。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得到民三分之二選舉通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則只需到多數票通過。財政影響：假如地方機構未獲選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅，如果選民不批准一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方稅收收可能減少。有關徵稅和罰款選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保證英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定私人力量執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力缺失綜合症（愛滋病），特指愛滋病毒帶菌者的傳染及具有性質的病，患愛滋病和帶菌者報告病例之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，倘果可能到底不明。假如現行用有對傳染病病例控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本條例被解釋爲必須加強疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排放和警告。禁止排放有性化學物於食水中，必須警告關於暴於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本條例的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素制定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵銷。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受償公債，提供資金改善舊金山市、縣以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否建造馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本償還現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的閒天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展閒天場地資金？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law? YES 287 → NO 288 →

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

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey? YES 293 → NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date? YES 296 → NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments? YES 299 → NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system? YES 302 → NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan? YES 305 → NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? YES 308 → NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成 288 NO 反對	¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?	應否授權市政府與其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?	F
290 SI 贊成 291 NO 反對	¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?	市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?	G
293 SI 贊成 294 NO 反對	¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?	應否授權市政府根據每年工資公平調查的結果，為某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?	H
296 SI 贊成 297 NO 反對	¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?	應否授權市政府在採納每年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?	I
299 SI 贊成 300 NO 反對	¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?	市政府應否將對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定?	J
302 SI 贊成 303 NO 反對	¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?	市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?	K
	La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota		
305 SI 贊成 306 NO 反對	¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?	市政府應否為本市"總綱規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"舊金山區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?	M
308 SI 贊成 309 NO 反對	¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?	市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展與油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?	N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

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

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



B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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



C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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





D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on: An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

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

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and

perience with
pperty interests
rhood districts
o represent the
able city in the

iam Brown, Jr.

rown, Jr. are:
Ave., Reservation
4 Vallejo St., Real
4th St., Graphic
n, 475 Connecticut
ph L. Espil, 2584
n Feagins, 481-½
eth Hanson, 245
tary. Rose Hough-
ong Hwang, 1437
dorica B. Lasola,
sen De-Shen Liu,
D. McCarthy, 626
Mary Moehle, 141
W. Nemir, 2310
, 120 Wetmore St.,
tapik, 160 Manor
tesearcher. Judith
t. Mary Jo Saeed,
ing, 260 Bay St.,
5 Hyde St., Mort-
929 Buchanan St.,

Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

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

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

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____
(4)_____
(5)_____

Board of Education
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

Comm. College Board
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

BART Board (If any)
(1)_____

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

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

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

Clemente Newball-Obregon, 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

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

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

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

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

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

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

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

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this electi
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, troller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Boar Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and m bers of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Bo Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of a will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	JUDGES		
Governor _____	SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
Lt. Governor _____		123	124
Secretary of State _____		126	127
Controller _____		129	130
Treasurer _____		132	133
Attorney General _____		135	136
Bd. of Equalization _____		138	139
U.S. Senate _____	COURT OF APPEAL		
U.S. Representative _____		141	142
State Senate _____ (If any)		144	145
St. Assembly _____		147	148
		150	151
		153	154
		158	159
		161	162
		164	165
		167	168
		170	171
		173	174
		176	177
		179	180

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

(Continued on Reverse Side)

A— You must write:

- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

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

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

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

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

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

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

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

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

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

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse**, 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

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

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

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

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

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

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

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Bellsle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

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

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

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

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

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

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

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

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

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

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

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

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

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

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

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

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

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

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

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

A. D. Norton

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

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe**, 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn**, 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan**, 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins**, 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin**, 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox**, 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers**, 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler**, 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace**, 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.**, 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein**, 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral**, 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez**, 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg**, 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil**, 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh**, 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker**, 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder**, 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

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

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales**, 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black**, 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone**, 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke**, 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie**, 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes**, 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes**, 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly**, 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey**, 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi**, 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard**, 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos**, 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo**, 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar**, 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison**, 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek**, 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey**, 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya**, 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards**, 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera**, 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts**, 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson**, 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt**, 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart**, 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall**, 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

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

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

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

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Dol,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46

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

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

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

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

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rossell,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

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

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setlan,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

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

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

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

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

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

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

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

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

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

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

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

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

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

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

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

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

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

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

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Dol,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

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

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

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

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

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

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebelm**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

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

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

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

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

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

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

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

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

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

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebelm,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

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

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

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

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

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

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

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

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

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

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

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37

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

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St.; Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Hule,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

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

Fire Protection Bonds A

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

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

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

How "A" Got on the Ballot

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

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

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

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

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

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . .the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . .fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

We do not want this to happen again.

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

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

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

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

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

Moscone Center Financing



PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

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

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

Moscone Center Financing B

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

VOTE YES ON B.

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

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

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

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

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition B.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

Gina Moscone

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

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on B!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

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

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

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

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

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

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

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

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

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

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

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

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

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

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

YES 279
NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

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

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

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

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

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

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

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

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

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

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

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

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county.

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

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

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

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

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

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

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

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

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

YES 282
NO 283

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

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

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

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

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

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

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

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

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

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on D!

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

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

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

The San Francisco Board of Education:

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition D.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

Vote YES on D!

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

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

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

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

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

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

Vote YES on D!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

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

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

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

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

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

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

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

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

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

YES 285
NO 286

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors present voted No.

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

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

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

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

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

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

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

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

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

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

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

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

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

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

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

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

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

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

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

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

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

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

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

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

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

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

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

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

Vote **YES** on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

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

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

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

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

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

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

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

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

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

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

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

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

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

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

About the Ballot Arguments

Unofficial Matter:

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

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

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

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

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

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

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

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

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

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

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

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

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

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

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

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on H.

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

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

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

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

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

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

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

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

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

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

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

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

What is a Minority?

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

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

Vote No on Proposition H.

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

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

Police & Fire Pay



PROPOSITION I

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

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

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

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

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

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

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

Members, Board of Supervisors

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

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

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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

Police & Fire Age Requirements

J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

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

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

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

Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

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

Planning Initiative

M

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

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

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has not been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and not the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

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

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

**PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

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

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:
_____ _____
Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

sectors of San Francisco's

rancisco, the final word on

t the needs of resident San
ial interests and out-of-town

n M.
. *Phyllis Lyon*
. *Jack Morrison*
. *Dale Carlson*
. *David Looman*

nd Technicians Local 15
Chapter (NOW)

mittee

(SFLV)

)iamond Heights Neighborhood Association
)istrict One Political Action (Richmond District)
)uboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causin congestion; severe strains on ing prices; loss of open space unpleasant and unhealthy po

The Downtown Plan had answer. Neighborhood plann

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here 14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

REPUBLICAN I

As individual members of Central Committee, we dec growth and orderly developr

Proposition M is a respons struction of up to approxima space per year. Developme

Current City Land use an privileges to a few develope political processes and the Franciscans.

Massive political contrib have created loopholes, exe mit and encourage commen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—not according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

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

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is vital to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

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

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

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

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects -- Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

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

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

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

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

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

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

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

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

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

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? **YES 308** **NO 309**

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

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

Oil Development Moratorium



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

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

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

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

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

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

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

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

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

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

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

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

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

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

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

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

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

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

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

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

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320-1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

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

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE		PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
001	16th Assembly District 8th Senate District 5th Congressional District No BART Race	1200's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

16th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

002

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page

Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (If applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

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

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/16

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

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

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 4
Educator
Educadora 教育家

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

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 8
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 10
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 16
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

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

MIKE CURB, Republican 20

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

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 24
Author
Autora 作家

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 28
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 30
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 32
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 34
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 36
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 42
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 44
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 46
Retired Electrical Director
Director Electrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 48
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 50
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom 53
Union/Community Organizer
Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic 55
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫

RAY CULLEN, Libertarian 56
Certified Public Accountant
Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent 58
Aviator
Aviador 飛行家

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian 63
Attorney, Private Practice
Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom 64
Lawyer
Abogado 律師

BRUCE GLEASON, Republican 66
Attorney-at-Law
Abogado 律師

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic 67
Attorney General, California
Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長

GARY R. ODOM, American Independent 69
Attorney
Abogado 律師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 70

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

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic 74
Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican 75
Business Executive/Controller
Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom 77
Medical Relief Coordinator
Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 78

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
4/16

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian Financial Consultant Consultor Financiero 財務顧問	81 ➡
EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent Director, Patriotic Committee Director del Comité Patriótico	83 ➡
ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic United States Senator Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員	85 ➡
PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom Socialist Organizer Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者	87 ➡
ED ZSCHAU, Republican U.S. Congressman Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員	89 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	91 ➡

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SALA BURTON, Democratic Representative in Congress 5th District Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員	96 ➡
SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian Electronics Technician Técnico en Electrónica 電子技術員	98 ➡
MIKE GARZA, Republican	100 ➡
THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom Worker Trabajador 工人	102 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	104 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/16-D

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom Child Care Teacher Maestra de Guarderia Infantil 托兒所教師	115 ➡
MAX WOODS, Republican Cable Car Gripman Fijador de Tranvias con Cables 纜車司機	117 ➡
ART AGNOS, Democratic State Assemblyman Asambleista Estatal 州衆議員	119 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	121 ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

CITY & COUNTY
(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/16

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市参議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多５人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	185
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	186
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	187
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	188
NICOLE MYERS Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者	189
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	190
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	191
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	192
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	193
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	194
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	195
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	196
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	197
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	198
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	199
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	200
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	201
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	202
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/16-O

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	210 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	211 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	212 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación 舊金山教育局主席	213 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	214 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	215 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	216 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員	217 ➡
SODONIA WILSON Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	222 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	224 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董	225 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師	226 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 →
NO 236 →

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 →
NO 239 →

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 →
NO 242 →

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 →
NO 245 →

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 →
NO 248 →

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 →
NO 251 →

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 →
NO 256 →

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 →
NO 260 →

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯地方照顧公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作爲興建及改善公校之資金調度。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

53

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年監獄興建公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），撥款資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

54

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer los normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），撥款資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

55

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），撥款資金用於改善加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園，加州州立大學的十九個校園，加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

56

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohíbe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, el evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法規定人員之退休福利。禁止根據憲法規定的州官員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不是二十個人的退休福利相應增加，爲州節省開支$400,000。

57

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

財稅。家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間財產之資產的重新估值。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年將失三千七百萬元。發展以後每年遞增，州政府的援助將減輕地方上的損失。但州將需負擔用來抵上述減額的損失。

58

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須用選舉產生。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

59

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes pendientes en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

搬遷。財產稅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的房屋合格業主在符合下列條件之情況下保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本措施，否則提案對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出撥款給社區大學和公校的損失。

60

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之酬金。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別合約承包人之酬金。財政影響：設限對政府將來無。本提案將減少州及地方政府部門將來的開支。初期州及地方第一年可省開支約一億二千五百萬元。但開支的減省可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期的七十億元而抵銷。支出甚至可能超出節省款額。

61

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 →
NO 262 →

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 →
NO 264 →

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 →
NO 267 →

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 →
NO 270 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 →
NO 274 →

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 →
NO 277 →

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

YES 279 →
NO 280 →

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

YES 282 →
NO 283 →

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

YES 285 →
NO 286 →

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan los dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren *la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.*

地方稅收。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別或加稅，必須得選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須得選民多數票通過，則政府得以防止地方機構未得選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方政府就收可能減少。有關徵稅和罰選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。州立法機會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言，制定私人力加執行本提案的辦法。財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支無抵觸影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調症候（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒的帶病者的狀況具有傳染性病徵，必受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響，執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，結果可能有很不同。若將現有有對傳染病所控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有實質影響，假如本提案被解釋爲必須加強疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia *acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas.* Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

預防毒物之排放與曝露。禁止排放有性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關曝露於有性化學物的警告。財政影響，州及地方政府一九八七年執行本條例的開支估計約爲$500,000，條例文例多種詮釋規定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。例文例由收取的罰款部分提供。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市、郡以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否興建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的閒天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展閒天場地資產？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

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

YES 287 →
NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →
NO 291 →

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

YES 293 →
NO 294 →

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

YES 296 →
NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →
NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →
NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →
NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →
NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構員僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度？

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利？

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，具某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資？

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額？

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定？

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外？

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積？

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施？

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

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

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

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。



STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。



STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。





STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

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

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

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

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____
(4)_____
(5)_____

Board of Education
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

Comm. College Board
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

BART Board (if any)
(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

	STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS	
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

tor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2650 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

...5 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what po party you consider yours you can check the box on the saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it d matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates other political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote f candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a pr election, you can only choose among the candidates o party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this elect
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, troller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Boa Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and bers of the Board of Supervisors, School and College B Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of a will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	JUDGES		
Governor	SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
Lt. Governor		123	124
Secretary of State		126	127
Controller		129	130
Treasurer		132	133
Attorney General		135	136
Bd. of Equalization		138	139
U.S. Senate	COURT OF APPEAL		
U.S. Representative		141	142
State Senate (If any)		144	145
St. Assembly		147	148
		150	151
		153	154
		158	159
		161	162
		164	165
		167	168
		170	171
		173	174
		176	177
		179	180

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:

- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jedediа Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hansе**, 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**, 225 Dubocе Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Bellsle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin-M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe**, 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn**, 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan**, 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins**, 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin**, 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox**, 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers**, 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler**, 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace**, 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.**, 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein**, 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral**, 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez**, 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Millberg**, 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil**, 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh**, 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker**, 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder**, 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales**, 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black**, 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone**, 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke**, 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie**, 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes**, 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes**, 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly**, 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey**, 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi**, 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard**, 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos**, 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo**, 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar**, 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison**, 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek**, 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey**, 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya**, 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards**, 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera**, 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts**, 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson**, 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt**, 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart**, 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall**, 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Hule,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Loule,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Morl,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rossell,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Elko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setlan,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives and retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani;** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Amnilano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Elsenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saolt,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Dol,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one does happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279
NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. Not a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE...
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will not change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters; "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) Never sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies out of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in current City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 more automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 new MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Thellen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:
Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:
Date _____ Deputy Registrar _____

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

DATE OF BIRTH

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

: sectors of San Francisco's

'rancisco, the final word on

ıt the needs of resident San
cial interests and out-of-town

ɔn M.
ı. Phyllis Lyon
ı. Jack Morrison
ı. Dale Carlson
ı. David Looman

ınd Technicians Local 15
ɔ Chapter (NOW)

)
)
ınmittee

Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of [illegible] the last decade has had a di[illegible] Area's environment—causing congestion; severe strains on [illegible] ing prices; loss of open space unpleasant and unhealthy pol[illegible]

The Downtown Plan had [illegible] answer. Neighborhood plann[illegible]

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighbor-

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here 14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

REPUBLICAN L[illegible]

As individual members of [illegible] Central Committee, we dee[illegible] growth and orderly developn[illegible]

Proposition M is a respons[illegible] struction of up to approxima[illegible] space per year. Developmer[illegible]

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Current City Land use and[illegible] privileges to a few developer[illegible] political processes and the [illegible] Franciscans.

Massive political contrib[illegible] have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy afford-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco? **YES 308** **NO 309**

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE		PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
002	16th Assembly District No State Senate Race 5th Congressional District No BART Race	1300's, 2100's 2700's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

16th A.D.
8th S.D.
5th C.D.
8th BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
OCT 22 1986
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (If applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/16

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 2
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 4
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 6
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 8
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 10
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 16
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 18
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 20

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 22
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 24
Author
Autora 作家

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 28
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 檢縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 30
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 32
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 34
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 36
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 42
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 44
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 46
Retired Electrical Director
Director Electrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 48
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 50
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	53
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	55
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師	56
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	63
ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	64
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	66
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	67
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	74
CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	75
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

4/16

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian Financial Consultant Consultor Financiero 財務顧問	81 ➡
EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent Director, Patriotic Committee Director del Comitè Patriòtico	83 ➡
ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic United States Senator Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員	85 ➡
PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom Socialist Organizer Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者	87 ➡
ED ZSCHAU, Republican U.S. Congressman Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員	89 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	91 ➡

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SALA BURTON, Democratic Representative in Congress 5th District Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員	96 ➡
SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian Electronics Technician Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員	98 ➡
MIKE GARZA, Republican	100 ➡
THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom Worker Trabajador 工人	102 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	104 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
5/16-S

5 State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参議員

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

STATE SENATOR

RUSSELL GRAY, Republican Independent Businessman Hombre de Negocios Independiente 獨立商人	105 ➡
QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado 市参議員	107 ➡
LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic Member of the Legislature Miembro de la Legislatura 議員	109 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	111 ➡

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom Child Care Teacher Maestra de Guarderia Infantil 托兒所教師	115 ➡
MAX WOODS, Republican Cable Car Gripman Fijador de Tranvias con Cables 纜車司機	117 ➡
ART AGNOS, Democratic State Assemblyman Asambleista Estatal 州衆議員	119 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	121 ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/16

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多5人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	185
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	186
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	187
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	188
NICOLE MYERS Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者	189
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	190
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	191
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	192
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	193
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	194
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	195
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	196
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	197
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	198
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	199
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	200
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	201
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	202
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/16-B

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	210 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator//Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	211 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	212 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	213 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	214 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	215 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	216 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	217 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	222 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	224 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	225 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師	226 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	227 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍照顧公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作為興建及改善公校之資金用支，每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

53

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年青少年及成人州監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），供興建全州的矯養和監禁少年及成人州監獄。

54

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），供興建全州的民用家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

55

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción e mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nuevas localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），供興建全州的高等教育設施及改善設施。包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

56

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohíbe hacer los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

<u>高級政府人員之退休福利</u>。禁將憲法規定的某些州官員的退休福利作為給予繼任者的退休福利的限度。財政影響：約省$400,000。

57

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

<u>財產</u>，<u>家庭財產轉讓</u>。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實業於課稅估價。財政影響：州國少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年損失三千七百萬元。學區以後每年損失。州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失，但州普通基金將承上述數額的損失。

58

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

<u>民選地方檢察官</u>。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉產出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財務影響。

59

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 90 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

<u>調換</u>，<u>替代住宅</u>。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民合符某些條件下出售住宅而保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本提案，否則該案對州或地方政府無直接財政影響。若州議會通過法例實施本提案，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出款項會補償社區大學和公校損失。

60

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

<u>官員，公共僱員，承包人之酬償</u>。限制州政官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之酬償。財政影響：政府因此產生淨未知。本提案將使州及地方政府節省酬償未來的開資，估計州及地方第一年可省錢約一億二千五百萬元，但節省的開資可能因必須繳納現行酬償的開約七千萬元的現款。支出將可能超出節省數額。

61

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o sumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos especiales los dos tercerss partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1986. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方稅務。地方政府及行政區有資格收稅的特別機構如學、必須得選民三分之二票數通過；普收稅普遍提高加稅，則須得選民多數票通過，財政影響，假如地方機構未得選民通過而徵收稅或增稅，如果選民不贊同一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方機構將會可能減少，有關費用和新增稅務通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言，制度個人力與執行本條款的權限，財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por los cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調症候（愛滋病）。有病菌與有病菌帶有的原因爲傳染病例。應受有關機構和衛生部門的管制之例。財政影響，假若本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解作本提案，假若可能將很不同。若如只按照現有對傳染病例的管制之例外對待愛滋病。在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有重大影響，若如本代表機構將作爲必須加強疾病控制，則視乎採用的措施，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $300,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排洩與暴露。禁止將有毒化學物質倒進水中，並須提出有關暴露於有毒化學物質的警告，財政影響，假若地方政府一九八七年執行本條例的開支估計爲$300,000，此後開支與多種因素關連，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支得由收取的罰款部分償還。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

救火設施系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，郡以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否興建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意新發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12½ de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的閒天場地基金於課後活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展閒天場地資金？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以前退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 →

NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →

NO 291 →

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 →

NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 →

NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →

NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →

NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →

NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →

NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

舊金山被授權市政府與其他公共機構員工加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市職員的活動時獲得退休福利?

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據每年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納每年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防員工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定?

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objetos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"舊金山規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機
A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。



STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。



STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。





STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Candidates for BART Director

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the charac-

[have and will
iane Feinstein's
ari's plans for
od business and
perience with
operty interests
rhood districts
o represent the
able city in the

iam Brown, Jr.

rown, Jr. are:
Ave., Reservation
4 Vallejo St., Real
4th St., Graphic
n, 475 Connecticut
ph L. Espil, 2584
n Feagins, 481-½
eth Hanson, 245
tary. Rose Hough-
ong Hwang, 1437
dorica B. Lasola,
sen De-Shen Liu,
O. McCarthy, 626
Mary Moehle, 141
W. Nemir, 2310
, 120 Wetmore St.,
stapik, 160 Manor

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____
(4)_____
(5)_____

Board of Education
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

Comm. College Board
(1)_____
(2)_____
(3)_____

BART Board (if any)
(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

Robert L. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Candidates for BART Director

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES
Governor _____
Lt. Governor _____
Secretary of State _____
Controller _____
Treasurer _____
Attorney General _____
Bd. of Equalization _____
U.S. Senate _____
U.S. Representative _____
State Senate _____ (If any)
St. Assembly _____

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
_____	123	124
_____	126	127
_____	129	130
_____	132	133
_____	135	136
_____	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
_____	141	142
_____	144	145
_____	147	148
_____	150	151
_____	153	154
_____	158	159
_____	161	162
_____	164	165
_____	167	168
_____	170	171
_____	173	174
_____	176	177
_____	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hansе**, 434 31st Ave.; Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**; 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez,** 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll,** 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones,** 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice,** 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy,** 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty,** 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman,** 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher,** 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell,** 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv, Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . .the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures

C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter.; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne,* Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay



PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **K** would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting all from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305
NO 306

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

M Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired. Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor
Mary J. O'Brien

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members

Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the *registrar of voters* no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____
Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____
FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____
DATE OF BIRTH

_____
NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____
RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308
NO 309

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

003

16th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1400's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

16th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
OCT 23 1986
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application . . . . . card
Voter Selection Coupon . . . . . card
Location of Your Polling Place . . . 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

1/16

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic Mayor, City of Los Angeles Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長	2 ➡
MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom Educator Educadora 教育家	4 ➡
GARY V. MILLER, American Independent Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist. Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董	6 ➡
JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian Professor of Economics Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授	8 ➡
GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican Governor, State of California Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長	10 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	12 ➡

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent Truck Driver Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機	16 ➡
LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic Lieutenant Governor Vicegobernador 副州長	18 ➡
MIKE CURB, Republican	20 ➡
CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom College Instructor Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師	22 ➡
NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian Author Autora 作家	24 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	26 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

STATE

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(ESTADO)

州職位

2

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 28
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 檢縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 30
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 32
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 34
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 36
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 42
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 44
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 46
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 48
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 50
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	53
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	55
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師	56
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	63
ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	64
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	66
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	67
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	74
CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	75
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

4/16

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 81
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 83
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 85
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 87
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 89
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SALA BURTON, Democratic 96
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 98
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 100

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 102
Worker
Trabajador 工人

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

5

5/16-O

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARGARET "MEG" WEBER, Peace and Freedom 115
Child Care Teacher
Maestra de Guarderia Infantil 托兒所教師

MAX WOODS, Republican 117
Cable Car Gripman
Fijador de Tranvias con Cables 纜車司機

ART AGNOS, Democratic 119
State Assemblyman
Asambleista Estatal 州衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 121

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

YES 123
NO 124

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall **JOSEPH GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

YES 126
NO 127

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

YES 129
NO 130

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/16

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多5人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	185
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	186
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	187
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	188
NICOLE MYERS Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者	189
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	190
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	191
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	192
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	193
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	194
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	195
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	196
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	197
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	198
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	199
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	200
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	201
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	202
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

9/16-B
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	210 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator//Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	211 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	212 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	213 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	214 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	215 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	216 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	217 ➡
SODONIA WILSON Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	222 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	224 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	225 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師	226 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯投資興建公辦法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作為興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年興建監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公辦法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公辦法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於興建加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施。包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州商船學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohíbe hacer los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法修定人員之退休福利。取消現行憲法修定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：節省開支金州政民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，每州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

房稅。家庭房產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之資產於房屋估價。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元。一九八八至八九年將損失三千七百萬元。一九八八至八九年後將，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失。但州得為全州學校上述數額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉產出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

調稅。替代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估價。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本提案，否則投票對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出民助金補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eleminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終開支未知。本提案將開出地方政府額外費用未知的經費。估計州及地方第一年可省開資約一億二千五百萬元。但節省的經費可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期的七千萬元而抵銷。支出實數可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成 / 262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方捐稅。地方政府及行政區若實施收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數票通過。財政影響，阻止地方機構未經選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方稅收可能減少。憲法條例和州經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許市。

62

263 SI 贊成 / 264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言，制定私人方面執行本提案的辦法。財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支並無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成 / 267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力消失綜合症（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響，執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能到然不同。假如採用現有對傳染病所控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響，假如本提案被解釋爲必須加強疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成 / 270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排洩與曝露。禁止排洩有毒性化學物於食水中，必須警告有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響，州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素限定。但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵償。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成 / 274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46，200，000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，縣以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成 / 277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140，000，000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成 / 280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成 / 283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展露天場地資業？

D

285 SI 贊成 / 286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度？

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利？

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資？

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額？

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並廢消警局和消防局的强制退休年齡規定？

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外？

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納强制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積？

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施？

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意

如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。



STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2



BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3



HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步

請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

**Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.**

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

Board of Education

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

Comm. College Board

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

BART Board (if any)

(1) _____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES
Governor _____
Lt. Governor _____
Secretary of State _____
Controller _____
Treasurer _____
Attorney General _____
Bd. of Equalization _____
U.S. Senate _____
U.S. Representative _____
State Senate _____ (If any)
St. Assembly _____

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	156	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been ch

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., *Representative in Congress*. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., *Home Executive*. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 *Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor*. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, *507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts.* Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59
My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 *Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook*. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years
My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez,** 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll,** 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones,** 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice,** 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy,** 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty,** 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman,** 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher,** 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell,** 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Rence Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A . . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures

C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter**; or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~**; or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafil, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **E** would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE. . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year **since** date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits



PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **F** would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne,* Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau
Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay



PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption



PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **K** would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

M

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____

A.V. Prec. No. _____

Ballot Type _____

Affidavit No. _____

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____

Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

_____

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them o to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vo Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Puge
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or ~~more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

004

16th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:

1500's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

17th A.D.
no Senate
6th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
OCT 23 1986
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

1/17

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 2
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 4
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 6
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 8
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 10
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 16
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 18

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 20
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 22
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 24
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 28
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 30
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 32
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 34
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 36
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 校縣縣參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 42
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 44
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 46
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 48
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 50
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE (ESTADO) 州職位

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	53
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Pùblico Certificado 註册公共會計師	55
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	56
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	63
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	64
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	66
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	67
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	74
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員	75
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

4/17-6

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 81
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 83
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 85
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 87
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 89
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BARBARA BOXER, Democratic 96
Member of Congress
Miembro del Congreso 美國衆議員

FRANKLIN "HARRY" ERNST III, Republican 98
Publisher/Architect
Editor/Arquitecto 出版人／建築師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 100

5

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/17-O

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian	**115** ➡
WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic Legislator/Lawyer Legislador/Abogado 議員／律師	**117** ➡
JEFF CORINO, Republican Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人	**119** ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	**121** ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 123** ➡ **NO 124** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 126** ➡ **NO 127** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 129** ➡ **NO 130** ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多 5 人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	185
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	186
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	187
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	188
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	189
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	190
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	191
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	192
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	193
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	194
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	195
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	196
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	197
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	198
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	199
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	200
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	201
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	202
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	210
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	211
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	212
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	213
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	214
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	215
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	216
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	217
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	218

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	222
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	224
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	225
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	226
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格什一休斯投資租購公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年興建新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和興建青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 100 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於興加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumentan en el futuro.

憲法法定人員之退休福利。取消根據任期的薪酬來決定某些州憲法法定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響，防止將來當金州性民選官員加薪時，不是二十個人的退休福利相應增加，局州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

贈稅。家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實業於重新估價，財政影響，將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年將損失三千七百萬元。數額以後每年遞增，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失，但州普通基金將承擔上述數額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉選出。財政影響，對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

調稅。替代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響，除非州議會通過法例以實施本措施，否則提案對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響，假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出款項補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響，最終財政影響未知。本提案將為州及地方政府節省數額未知的經費，估計州及地方單一年可各節省約一億二千五百萬元，但節省的經費可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期約七十億元而抵銷。支出淨額可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方課稅. 地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得選民三分之二票數通過；徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須選民多數票通過，財政影響，阻止地方機構未經選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不通過一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方稅育稅收可能減少，有關徵稅和須經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言. 規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言，制定私人力加執行本提案的辦法，財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支並無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力消失綜合症（愛滋病）. 宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制，財政影響，執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能很不同。假如現行用以對染病和帶菌者的隔離對付愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本提案被解釋爲必須加强疾病控制，則按爭各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制廢物之排放與環境. 禁止排放有性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響，州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲 $500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定。但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支得由收取的罰款部分抵償。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承擔$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，縣以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯敦尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地實業？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 →
NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →
NO 291 →

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 →
NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 →
NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →
NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →
NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →
NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →
NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成 288 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?	應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構爲僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?	F
290 SI 贊成 291 NO 反對	¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?	市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?	G
293 SI 贊成 294 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?	應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?	H
296 SI 贊成 297 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?	應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?	I
299 SI 贊成 300 NO 反對	¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?	市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的强制退休年齡規定?	J
302 SI 贊成 303 NO 反對	¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?	市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?	K
La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota			
305 SI 贊成 306 NO 反對	¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?	市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納强制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?	M
308 SI 贊成 309 NO 反對	¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?	市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?	N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意

如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。



STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。



STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**

D 第三步

請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。



STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	
Governor	
Lt. Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Bd. of Equalization	
U.S. Senate	
U.S. Representative	
State Senate	(If any)
St. Assembly	

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillie Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Muelier,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A yes vote on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing whiie the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE. . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year **since** date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? **YES 290** **NO 291**

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements

J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption



PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **K** would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

M

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

**PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members

Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____

A.V. Prec. No. _____

Ballot Type _____

Affidavit No. _____

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____

Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____

DATE OF BIRTH

_____

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978-1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

- Yes on Proposition N.
- Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

005

17th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
6th Congressional District
No BART Race

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:

4200's, 4600's
4700's, 6100's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

17th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
8th BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

006

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application . . . . . card
Voter Selection Coupon . . . . . card
Location of Your Polling Place . . . 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/17

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

STATE

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 2
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 4
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 6
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 8
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 10
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 16
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 18

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 20
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 22
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 24
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

2 州職位

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic **28**
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom **30**
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian **32**
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent **34**
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican **36**
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. **38**

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican **42**
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent **44**
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic **46**
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian **48**
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom **50**
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. **52**

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE (ESTADO) 州職位

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	53
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師	55
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	56
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	63
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	64
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	66
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	67
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	74
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員	75
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
4/17-5

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 81
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 83
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 85
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 87
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 89
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 96
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 98

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 100
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 102
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/17-O

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian	**115** ➡
WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic Legislator/Lawyer Legislador/Abogado 議員／律師	**117** ➡
JEFF CORINO, Republican Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人	**119** ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	**121** ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 123** ➡ **NO 124** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 126** ➡ **NO 127** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 129** ➡ **NO 130** ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多5人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	185
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	186
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	187
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	188
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	189
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	190
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	191
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	192
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	193
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	194
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	195
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	196
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	197
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	198
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	199
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	200
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	201
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	202
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	210 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	211 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	212 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	213 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	214 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	215 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	216 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	217 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董	222 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	224 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	225 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	226 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍租購公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作爲興建及改善公校之資金開支，每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年興建新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於興建加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施。包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohíbe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法規定人員之退休福利。取消根據任何於新條來決定某些州憲法規定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，爲州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

稅稅，家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實業於重新估值。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元；一九八八至八九年將失三千七百萬元，數額以後每年遞增。州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失。但州會減少給予上述數額的開支。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經過舉選出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

調稅，舊代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本提案，否則提案對州及地方政府收入並無財政影響，假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將有減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出民衆金額償還社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eleminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員，公共雇員，承包人之薪酬。限制有關官員，公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終財政影響未知。本提案將費用及地方政府節省數額未知的開費，估計州及地方第一年可合節省約一億二千五百萬元，但節省的開費可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期約七十億元而抵銷，支出甚至可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieran la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方稅收。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得到民三分之二票數通過；徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須得到民多數票通過。財政影響：阻止地方機構未獲選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不通過一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。省與學區和州選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保證英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定強人力加執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調合症（愛滋病），具体愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管轄。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能兩然不同。假如只使用現有對傳染病和防制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本提案與解釋爲必須加强疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排洩與曝露。禁止排洩毒性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵償。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，縣以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否興建馬所康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展露天場地實業？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?
YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?
YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?
YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?
YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?
YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?
YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?
YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?
YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度？

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位辭職以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利？

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，為某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資？

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額？

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的强制退休年齡規定？

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外？

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納强制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積？

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施？

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."



B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.



C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**





D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

~~AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE~~ ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Candidates for BART Director

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	
Governor	
Lt. Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Bd. of Equalization	
U.S. Senate	
U.S. Representative	
State Senate	(If any)
St. Assembly	

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe**, 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn**, 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan**, 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins**, 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin**, 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox**, 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers**, 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler**, 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace**, 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.**, 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein**, 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral**, 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez**, 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg**, 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil**, 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh**, 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker**, 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder**, 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales**, 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black**, 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone**, 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke**, 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie**, 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes**, 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes**, 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly**, 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey**, 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi**, 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard**, 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos**, 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo**, 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar**, 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison**, 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek**, 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey**, 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya**, 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards**, 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera**, 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts**, 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson**, 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt**, 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart**, 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall**, 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #_____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . .the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures

C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits



PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition F.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne,* Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau
Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay



PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements

J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

**PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS
AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____

A.V. Prec. No. _____

Ballot Type _____

Affidavit No. _____

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____

Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____

DATE OF BIRTH

_____

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here 14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

006

17th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
4400's, 4500's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

17th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

007

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

1/17

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 2
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 4
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 6
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 8
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 10
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 16
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 18

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 20
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 22
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 24
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE (ESTADO) 州職位

2

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 28
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 30
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 32
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 34
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 36
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 校縣縣參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 42
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 44
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 46
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 48
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 50
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

3

3/17

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(ESTADO)

外職位

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	53
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師	55
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	56
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	63
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	64
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	66
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	67
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	74
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員	75
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

STATE

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

4/17-5

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 81
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 83
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 85
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 87
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 89
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 96
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 98

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 100
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 102
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

5

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian	**115** ➡
WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic Legislator/Lawyer Legislador/Abogado 議員／律師	**117** ➡
JEFF CORINO, Republican Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人	**119** ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	**121** ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 123** ➡ **NO 124** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 126** ➡ **NO 127** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 129** ➡ **NO 130** ➡

5/17-O
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 → NO 133 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 → NO 136 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 → NO 139 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 → NO 142 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 → NO 145 →
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 → NO 148 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 → NO 151 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 → NO 154 →

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
8/17

CITY & COUNTY
(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多５人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	185
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	186
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	187
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	188
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	189
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	190
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	191
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	192
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	193
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	194
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	195
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	196
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	197
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	198
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	199
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	200
NICOLE MYERS Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者	201
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	202
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/17-O

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	210
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	211
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	212
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	213
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	214
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	215
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	216
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	217
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	218

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	222
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	224
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	225
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	226
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯投資購買公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

53

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年興建新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

54

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

55

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於員加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

56

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法法定人員之退休福利。取消根據任何新興案決定某些州憲法法定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來需全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，局州節省開支$400,000。

57

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

58

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉選出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

59

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

房稅，老民住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民合符某些條件下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估價。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本提案，否則從來對州及地方政府收取直接財政影響。假如州議會通過實施本提案，本的估價，按業主收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出援助金補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

60

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制給官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終財政影響未知。本提案將使州及地方政府節省數額未知的經費，估計州及地方第一年可各節省約一億二千五百萬元。但節省的經費可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期的七十億元而抵銷，支出實數可能超出節省數目。

61

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION, For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方捐稅。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數票通過。財政影響：假如地方機構未獲選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅，如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關徵稅和經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言。制度私人力量執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力喪失綜合症（愛滋病），責佈帶有病毒的散佈及具傳染性病狀，患受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能迥然不同。假如以現用隔離對傳染病的控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本代表被解釋爲必須加強疾病控制，則按事項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

飲用水物之排放有限制。禁止排放有毒性化學物於食水中，必須警告關乎露於有毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本條例的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支與多種因素有關，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵償。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供舊金山市，縣以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地資業？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成 288 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?	應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?	F
290 SI 贊成 291 NO 反對	¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?	市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?	G
293 SI 贊成 294 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?	應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，為某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?	H
296 SI 贊成 297 NO 反對	¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?	應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?	I
299 SI 贊成 300 NO 反對	¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?	市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定?	J
302 SI 贊成 303 NO 反對	¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?	市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?	K
La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota			
305 SI 贊成 306 NO 反對	¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?	市政府應否為本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?	M
308 SI 贊成 309 NO 反對	¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?	市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?	N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."



B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.



C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**



D 第三步
請把帶銖之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:

- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	
Governor	
Lt. Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Bd. of Equalization	
U.S. Senate	
U.S. Representative	
State Senate	(If any)
St. Assembly	

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy,** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard**, 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe**, 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn**, 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan**, 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins**, 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin**, 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox**, 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers**, 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler**, 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace**, 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.**, 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein**, 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral**, 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez**, 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald**, 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg**, 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil**, 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh**, 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires**, 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker**, 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder**, 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales**, 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black**, 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone**, 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke**, 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie**, 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes**, 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes**, 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly**, 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey**, 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi**, 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard**, 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos**, 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo**, 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar**, 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison**, 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek**, 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey**, 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya**, 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards**, 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera**, 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts**, 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson**, 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt**, 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart**, 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall**, 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #_____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures

C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~;~~ **; or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation — but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85 .
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting YES on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

About the Ballot Arguments

Unofficial Matter:

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau
Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **J** would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption



PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **K** would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____
Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____
FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____
DATE OF BIRTH

_____
NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____
RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh.
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character."

Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308
NO 309

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or ~~more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320-1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

007

17th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
5th Congressional District
No BART Race

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
4800's, 5700's
5900's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

17th A.D.
8th S.D.
5th C.D.
8th BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

008

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application . . . . . card
Voter Selection Coupon . . . . . card
Location of Your Polling Place . . . 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 2
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 4
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 6
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 8
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 10
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 16
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 18

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 20
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 22
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 24
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE (ESTADO)

州職位

2

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic **28**
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom **30**
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian **32**
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent **34**
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican **36**
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. **38**

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican **42**
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent **44**
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic **46**
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian **48**
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom **50**
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. **52**

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	53
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Pùblico Certificado 註册公共會計師	55
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	56
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	63
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	64
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	66
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	67
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	74
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員	75
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
4/17-5

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 81
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 83
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 85
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 87
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 89
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 96
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 98

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 100
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 102
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/17-S

State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参議員

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

STATE SENATOR

RUSSELL GRAY, Republican Independent Businessman Hombre de Negocios Independiente 独立商人	105 ➡
QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado 市参議員	107 ➡
LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic Member of the Legislature Miembro de la Legislatura 議員	109 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	111 ➡

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian	115 ➡
WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic Legislator/Lawyer Legislador/Abogado 議員／律師	117 ➡
JEFF CORINO, Republican Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人	119 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	121 ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 → NO 133 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 → NO 136 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 → NO 139 →

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 → NO 142 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 → NO 145 →
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 → NO 148 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 → NO 151 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 → NO 154 →

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/17

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多 5 人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	185
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	186
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	187
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	188
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	189
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	190
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	191
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	192
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	193
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	194
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	195
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	196
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	197
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	198
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	199
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	200
NICOLE MYERS Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者	201
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	202
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/17-B

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	210 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	211 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	212 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	213 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	214 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	215 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	216 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	217 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董	222 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	224 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	225 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	226 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍租購公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年建築新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於興辦加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohíbe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法法定人員之退休福利。取消根據任者的薪酬來決定某些州憲法法定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，爲州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

贈稅。家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之資產於重新估值。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元；一九八八至八九年損失三千七百萬元。數額以後年度遞增，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失。但州普通基金將承擔上述數額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經過選舉選出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

舊稅、舊代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本措施，否則提案對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將會減少。每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出援助金補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：限制財政影響未知。本提案將費用及地方政府節省數額未知的開費。估計州及地方第一年可省約一億二千五百萬元，但節省的開費可能以必須補償或休病假和休假期的七十億元而抵銷。支出實額可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方課稅。地方政府及行政機構若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數票通過。財政影響：阻止地方機構未經選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不通過一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關罰鍰和須經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言，制定私人力量執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調合症（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能頗然不同。假如只採用現有對傳染病用的控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本代案被解釋爲必須加強疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的使用，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制廢物之排洩與暴露。禁止排洩毒性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關暴露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵償。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債。承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市、縣以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯頓尼會展中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地實業？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方課稅。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須得選民多數票通過。財政影響，阻止地方機構未得選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方稅收可能減少。有關塗鴉和煽選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定私人方面執行本提案的辦法。財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支並無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力消失綜合症（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響，執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能頗然不同。假如只視用現有對傳染病所控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本民案使財務局必須加强疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制廢物之排洩與曝露。禁止排洩毒性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響，州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵償。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，轄以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃歲入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的歲入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地資業？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 →
NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →
NO 291 →

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 →
NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 →
NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →
NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →
NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →
NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →
NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度？

F

---

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利？

G

---

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資？

H

---

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額？

I

---

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的强制退休年齡規定？

J

---

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外？

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

---

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納强制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積？

M

---

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施？

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意

如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."



B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.



C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**



D 第三步

請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Candidates for BART Director

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse**, 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez,** 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll,** 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones,** 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice,** 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy,** 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty,** 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman,** 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher,** 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell,** 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were consfructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . .the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279
NO 280

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter.; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **E** would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE. . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.



Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne,* Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay

I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July lst. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

K

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **K** would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984-85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

- Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.
- Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

- Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.
- Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.
- Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

- Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.
- Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.
- Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M
Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308
NO 309

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the prece graph, when agreed by the memb organization.

The retirement board shall authority to establish procedures compensation and collect contrib interest for representative service culation of compensation herein n used in determining average final tion in computing the member's allowance.

This section shall be effective N 1986. This section shall not apply to system members or their successor who retired or terminated prior to 4, 1986. This section shall not representative service prior to a n fective date of membership with the system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may m pay equity adjustments to the basi recommended by the civil service pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.4 that said adjustments shall not ex equity differentials identified by vice commission in its survey req this section and provided further adjustments may be vetoed in who by the Mayor, subject to the prov tion 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifi ies in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third ye for police officers, police patrol women protective officers shall be accordance with the general percent tial between seniority steps found ranges included in the cities certifie service commission for the same cl

(3) for said members of the polic other than police officers, police p and women protective officers sha same percent of adjustment as that said ordinance for police officers year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amou fractional amount which may result age adjustment specified in this sec lars being taken to the next higher de

The rates of compensation set

Oil Development Moratorium

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition,, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age ~~or more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no **wife spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the **two** sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no **wife spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the **two** sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no **wife spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the **two** sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no **wife spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

008

17th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
5400's, 5500's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

17th A.D.
8th S.D.
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application . . . . . card
Voter Selection Coupon . . . . . card
Location of Your Polling Place . . . 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

1/17

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 2
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 4
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 6
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 8
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 10
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 16
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 18

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 20
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 22
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 24
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

2

州職位

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿

Secretary of State

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 28
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 30
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 32
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 34
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 36
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 縣縣參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官

Controller

請選 1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 42
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 44
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 46
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 48
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 50
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

2/17
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
(ESTADO)
GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
STATE

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	53
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Pùblico Certificado 註册公共會計師	55
MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	56
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	63
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	64
JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	66
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	67
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	74
ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員	75
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 81
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 83
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 85
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 87
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 89
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 96
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

MIKE GARZA, Republican 98

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 100
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 102
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

5

State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州參議員

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

STATE SENATOR

RUSSELL GRAY, Republican Independent Businessman Hombre de Negocios Independiente 獨立商人	105 ➡
QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado 市參議員	107 ➡
LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic Member of the Legislature Miembro de la Legislatura 議員	109 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	111 ➡

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員
Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian	115 ➡
WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic Legislator/Lawyer Legislador/Abogado 議員／律師	117 ➡
JEFF CORINO, Republican Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人	119 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	121 ➡

JUDICIAL — SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/17-S

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 → NO 133 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 → NO 136 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 → NO 139 →

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 → NO 142 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 → NO 145 →
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 → NO 148 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 → NO 151 →
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 → NO 154 →

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多 5 人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	185
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	186
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	187
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	188
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	189
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	190
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	191
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	192
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	193
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	194
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	195
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	196
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	197
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	198
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	199
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	200
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	201
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 現任市參議員	202
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

8/17
GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
CITY & COUNTY
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/17-O

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	210 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	211 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	212 ➡
JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	213 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	214 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	215 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	216 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	217 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	222 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	223 ➡
PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	224 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	225 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	226 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林-休斯校舍購買公債法案。本國家規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作為興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年監獄設施公債法案。本國家規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本國家規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本國家規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於為加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校區、加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

享法律定人員之退休福利。取消根據任何新頒佈決定某些州憲法定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，局州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una revaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

房稅。家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實業於房所估價。財政影響：減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年將損失三千七百萬元。數額以後每年遞增，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失，但州普通基金將承擔上述數額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經過舉選出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

房稅。替代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業代在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估價。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本措施，否則從來對州及地方政府收入無財政影響。假如州議會通過實施本提案的法例，物業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失。社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出代為全額補社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制州政官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終財政影響未知。本提案將節省州及地方政府開支數額未知的經費，估計州及地方第一年可省開資約一億二千五百萬元，但開資的經費可能因必須償還既有病假和休假假期約七千萬元而抵銷，支出甚至可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 →
NO 262 →

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 →
NO 264 →

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 →
NO 267 →

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 →
NO 270 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 →
NO 274 →

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 →
NO 277 →

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 →
NO 280 →

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 →
NO 283 →

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 →
NO 286 →

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方課稅。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二票數通過；徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數票通過。財政影響：阻止地方機構未經選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關徵稅和經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定私人方面執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調合症（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能酒然不同。假如只採用現有對傳染病患的控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本提案被解釋爲必須加强疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的應用，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排洩與暴露。禁止排洩毒性化學物於食水中，必須提出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定。但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵消。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市、縣以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃歲入公債以籌集經費？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的歲入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展露天場地資業？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

F

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構爲僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?

G

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?

H

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?

I

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?

J

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定?

K

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

M

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?

N

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意

如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。



STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2



BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3



HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**

D 第三步

請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

Board of Education

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

Comm. College Board

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

BART Board (if any)

(1) _____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO
53	235	236
54	238	239
55	241	242
56	244	245
57	247	248
58	250	251
59	252	253
60	255	256
61	259	260
62	261	262
63	263	264
64	266	267
65	269	270

CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO
A	273	274
B	276	277
C	279	280
D	282	283
E	285	286
F	287	288
G	290	291
H	293	294
I	296	297
J	299	300
K	302	303
M	305	306
N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	JUDGES		
Governor _____	SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
Lt. Governor _____		123	124
Secretary of State _____		126	127
Controller _____		129	130
Treasurer _____		132	133
Attorney General _____		135	136
Bd. of Equalization _____		138	139
U.S. Senate _____	COURT OF APPEAL		
U.S. Representative _____		141	142
State Senate _____ (If any)		144	145
St. Assembly _____		147	148
		150	151
		153	154
		158	159
		161	162
		164	165
		167	168
		170	171
		173	174
		176	177
		179	180

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse**, 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 551 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 100 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 144 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 41 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehali Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez,** 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll,** 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones,** 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice,** 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy,** 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty,** 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman,** 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher,** 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell,** 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Dol,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #_____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyilis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing**.

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything**.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~**; or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation

D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafil, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293
NO 294

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne,* Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history — the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

K

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/20/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____

A.V. Prec. No. _____

Ballot Type _____

Affidavit No. _____

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____

Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

_____

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here 14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them o to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vot Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Andersón
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danckas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or ~~more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

009

17th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District
No BART Race

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
5600's, 5800's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

19th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
8th BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jim Patterson

Registrar of Voters

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

STATE

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/19

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 2
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 4
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 6
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 8
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 10
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 16
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 18
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 20
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 22
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 24

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 28
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 30
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 32
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 34
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 36
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選1人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 42
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 44
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 46
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 48
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 50
Retired Electrical Director
Director Eléctrico Retirado 退休電工主任

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	53
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	55
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	56
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Público Certificado 註册公共會計師	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	63
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	64
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	66
ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	67
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno Vote for One

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Médicos 醫藥救援協調員	74
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	75
CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

4/19

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 81
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 83
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 85
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 87
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 89
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MIKE GARZA, Republican 96

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 98
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 100
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 102
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
5/19-O

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MICHAEL ROCCO, Republican Corporate Manager Gerente Corporativo 大公司經理	**115** ➡
JACKIE SPEIER, Democratic Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo 聖馬刁縣縣委議員	**117** ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	**119** ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 123** ➡ **NO 124** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 126** ➡ **NO 127** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 129** ➡ **NO 130** ➡

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 ➡ NO 133 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 ➡ NO 136 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 ➡ NO 139 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 ➡ NO 142 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 ➡ NO 145 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 ➡ NO 148 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 ➡ NO 151 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 ➡ NO 154 ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/19

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多 5 人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	185 ➡
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	186 ➡
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	187 ➡
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	188 ➡
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	189 ➡
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	190 ➡
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	191 ➡
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	192 ➡
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	193 ➡
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	194 ➡
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	195 ➡
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	196 ➡
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	197 ➡
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	198 ➡
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	199 ➡
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	200 ➡
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	201 ➡
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	202 ➡
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	203 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204 ➡

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/19-B

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	210 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員	211 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educación; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	212 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	213 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	214 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註冊公共會計師	215 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educación 舊金山教育局主席	216 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporación de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	217 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	222 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	223 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	224 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任教育委員	225 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董	226 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年綠休－休斯校舍興建公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作為興建及改善公校之資金與支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

53

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年度監獄興建公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000）以供資金用於興建和擴充少年及成人所監獄。

54

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），以供資金用於改善飲用供水系統以符合最低安全標準。

55

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en los institutos de los institutos públicos de educación superior en California, incluyendo los nuevos localizados de la Universidad de California, los 19 localizados de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育興建公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於興建加州的公共高等教育機構與擴充設備費用。包括加州大學的九個校區、加州州立大學的十九個校區、加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

56

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe hacer los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

退休憲定人員之福利資料。禁將現職憲定官的退休福利與憲定其他州雇員的憲定人員的退休福利的限定。財政影響：將止將來當金州特民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利額即增加，每州開當開支$400,000。

57

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $27 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

房稅，家庭財產轉讓。免於配偶之間以及父母與子女之間財產之資產計算新估稅。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年將損失三千七百萬元。物價以後每年提增，州政府的撥款將減輕地方上的損失。但州將需在撥款上追收額的損失。

58

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各郡的地方檢察官必須經選舉產生。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

59

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

房稅，將代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業主將其房產在下更換住宅期間保持原有住宅的估稅。財政影響：除非州議會同時依例以實施本修案，否則從事對州及地方政府財務無直接財政影響。假如州議會同時實施本提案的話，物業擁有人將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失。社區大學和分校區的損失將減少。州政府將由普通基金撥出代為金補損社區大學和分校的損失。

60

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal sería no determinado. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $725 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eliminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

薪酬，公共雇員，承包人之限制。限制付給官員、公共雇員和個別公用承包人之薪酬。財政影響：預期財政影響未知。本提案將為州及地方政府節減未來的開支，估計州及地方第一年可省開支約一億二千五百萬元。假期薪酬開支可減四分之一和休假開支的七十億元開銷。支出將需即時一筆付清。

61

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote — special taxes; majority — general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961, by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan los dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores se rehúsan la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 rn. de Agosto de 1986. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方稅收。地方政府及行政區有權徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得到三分之二選舉通過，徵收普通稅或加稅，則需得到多數票通過。財政影響：假如地方機構未獲選民通過而徵收新稅或加稅，如果選民不通過一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或加稅，地方機構有權收取較少。有關徵收和使用這些稅金的規定將不適用於特許權。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保證英語是州的官方通用語言。賦予私人力量執行本條款的權利。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無重大影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, tomando en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar costos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力的失調症候群（愛滋病）。表明愛滋病毒帶菌者的狀況是傳染性病原。患受有關隔離和舉報疾病的規則之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本條款，假如可能將現不病，假如以現用隔離有關傳染病的規則支付計劃，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有實質影響，假如本條款被解釋為要求額外疾病控制，財務事項將隨所採取的措施，每年成本可達數百萬。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohíbe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $800,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores para podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排污與暴露。禁止飲用有化學物的食水中，並須發出有關暴露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：假如地方政府一九八七年執行本條例的開支的計劃為$800,000，假設開支與多項因素而定。在每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由被罰的罰款部分負責。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，供改善舊金山市，郡以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建摩斯康展覽會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本償還舊金山現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課後活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購置和發展露天場地資產？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方稅務。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二同意通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數票通過。財政影響，假如地方機構未獲選民通過徵收新稅或增稅，如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關聯邦和州憲選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定私人力量執行本提案的辦法。財政影響，對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

<u>後天免疫力的失調合症（愛滋病）</u>。<u>患病</u>或帶有病毒的傳染及需要受檢疫的病歷，患愛滋病應報告病例之規則。財政影響，執行本提案之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，倘果可能酒然不同。假如以現用有關傳染病所控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如未來疾病得需要額外控制，財政學各項措施的費用，每年成本可達數億元。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

<u>限制廢物之排放與暴露</u>。禁止排放有性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關暴露於有性化學物的警告。財政影響，州及地方政府一九八七年執行本條例開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定。但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵消。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市，郡以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本償還現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地資業？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市雇員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 →
NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →
NO 291 →

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 →
NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 →
NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →
NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →
NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →
NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →
NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構為僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度？

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利？

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorias y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，為某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資？

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policia y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額？

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los limites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policia y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policia y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定？

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外？

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una politica obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los limites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否為本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積？

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施？

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。



STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2



BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3



HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**

D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	
Governor	
Lt. Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Bd. of Equalization	
U.S. Senate	
U.S. Representative	
State Senate	(if any)
St. Assembly	

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy.** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street
My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R. Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Hule,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St.; Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds



PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276
NO 277

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:
Vote for Proposition C.
Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter.; **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE. . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year **since** date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers? **YES 290** **NO 291**

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements

J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299
NO 300

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption



PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

M

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____
Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____
FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____
DATE OF BIRTH

_____
NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____
RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods; but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

›il and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and ›ther areas designated for the purpose of ransporting equipment to be used in or peronnel employed in the construction or operaion of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilies for the purpose of disposing of drilling uds, cuttings and produced waters generated the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire t the end of two (2) years after the effective ate of this ordinance unless extended by furer action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; enalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for ny use, development or construction of crude il and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of ny facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

010

19th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:

8400's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

19th A.D.
8th S.D.
5th C.D.
8th BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

011

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(ESTADO)

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

1/19

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

STATE

(GOBERNADOR) 州長
Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 2
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 4
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 6
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 8
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 10
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 16
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 18
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 20
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 22
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 24

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates then the number indicated. 26

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 28
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 30
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 32
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 橙縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 34
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 36
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 42
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 44
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 46
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 48
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 50
Retired Electrical Director
Director Electrico Retirado 退休電工主任

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent — 53
Aviator
Aviador 飛行家

MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom — 55
Union/Community Organizer
Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic — 56
California State Treasurer
Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫

RAY CULLEN, Libertarian — 58
Certified Public Accountant
Contador Pùblico Certificado 註册公共會計師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. — 59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長 Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic — 63
Attorney General, California
Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長

GARY R. ODOM, American Independent — 64
Attorney
Abogado 律師

CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian — 66
Attorney, Private Practice
Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師

ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom — 67
Lawyer
Abogado 律師

BRUCE GLEASON, Republican — 69
Attorney-at-Law
Abogado 律師

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. — 70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員 Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom — 74
Medical Relief Coordinator
Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic — 75
Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員

CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican — 77
Business Executive/Controller
Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. — 78

4

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
4/19

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom Socialist Organizer Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者	81 ➡
ED ZSCHAU, Republican U.S. Congressman Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員	83 ➡
BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian Financial Consultant Consultor Financiero 財務顧問	85 ➡
EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent Director, Patriotic Committee Director del Comitè Patriòtico	87 ➡
ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic United States Senator Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員	89 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	91 ➡

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MIKE GARZA, Republican	96 ➡
THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom Worker Trabajador 工人	98 ➡
SALA BURTON, Democratic Representative in Congress 5th District Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員	100 ➡
SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian Electronics Technician Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員	102 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	104 ➡

5

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

5/19-S

STATE SENATOR

State Senator (SENADOR ESTATAL) 州参議員

請選 1人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

RUSSELL GRAY, Republican Independent Businessman Hombre de Negocios Independiente 獨立商人	105 ➡
QUENTIN L. KOPP, Independent County Supervisor Supervisor del Condado 市參議員	107 ➡
LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic Member of the Legislature Miembro de la Legislatura 議員	109 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	111 ➡

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MICHAEL ROCCO, Republican Corporate Manager Gerente Corporativo 大公司經理	115 ➡
JACKIE SPEIER, Democratic Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo 聖馬刁縣縣參議員	117 ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	119 ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 123 ➡ NO 124 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 126 ➡ NO 127 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 129 ➡ NO 130 ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 132** ➡ **NO 133** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **STANLEY MOSK** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 135** ➡ **NO 136** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **MALCOLM M. LUCAS** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 138** ➡ **NO 139** ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **JOHN W. HOLMDAHL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 141** ➡ **NO 142** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall **WILLIAM A. NEWSOM** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 144** ➡ **NO 145** ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN ANTHONY KLINE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 147** ➡ **NO 148** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 150** ➡ **NO 151** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall **JOHN E. BENSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 153** ➡ **NO 154** ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/19

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多5人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	185
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	186
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	187
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	188
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	189
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	190
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	191
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	192
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任市參議員	193
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	194
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	195
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	196
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	197
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	198
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	199
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	200
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	201
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	202
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/19-B

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	210 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	211 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	212 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	213 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	214 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	215 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	216 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	217 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	222 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	223 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	224 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	225 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 社區大學校董	226 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART) 灣區快車系統董事
Member, Board of Directors BART District

請選 1 人
Vote por uno
Vote for One

EUGENE GARFINKLE Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任董事	231 ➡
ARLO SMITH Attorney/Transit Advocate/Abogado/Promotor de Transito 律師／公共交通倡導者	232 ➡
TOM SPINOSA Controller-Financial Consultant/Contralor-Consultante Financiero 主計員——財務顧問	233 ➡
JAMES PERON Policy Research Analyst/Investigador y Analista de Politicas 政策研究分析員	234 ➡

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 ➡
NO 236 ➡

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 ➡
NO 239 ➡

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 ➡
NO 242 ➡

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 ➡
NO 245 ➡

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 ➡
NO 248 ➡

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 ➡
NO 251 ➡

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 ➡
NO 253 ➡

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 ➡
NO 256 ➡

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 ➡
NO 260 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

53

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍供購公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作爲興建及改善公校之資金開支。每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

54

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年度新監獄公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供資金用於興建和擴張青少年及成人州監獄。

55

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

56

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de las instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供資金用於爲加州的公共高等教育興建與擴張設施。包括加州大學的九個校園，加州州立大學的十九個校園，加州的一〇六個社區大學校區以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

57

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumenten en el futuro.

憲法規定人員之退休福利。廢除根據任何於新條款決定某些州憲法規定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止將來當全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，爲州節省開支$400,000。

58

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

贈稅。家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之資產於課稅估值。財政影響：減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失約一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年損失三千七百萬元。數額以後每年遞增，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失。但州普通基金將承擔上述數額的損失。

59

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉產出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

60

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

贈稅。替代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持現有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會頒佈法例以實施本提案，否則民事對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。假如州議會頒過實施本提案的法例，但業主收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失。社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出民衆金錢給社區大學和公校區的損失。

61

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eleminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de 57 billones.

官員、公共僱員、承包人之薪酬。限制付給官員、公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終財政影響未知。本提案將爲州及地方政府節省數額未知的開支。估計州及地方第一年可各節省約一億二千五百萬元，但節省的開支可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期的七十億元而抵銷，支出甚至可能超出節省數額。

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

62

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las previsiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方捐稅。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須經選民三分之二贊成通過；徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須經選民多數贊成通過。財政影響：防止地方機關未經選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關徵稅和經選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

63

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保證英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支無直接影響。

64

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力消失綜合症（愛滋病）。宣佈愛滋病毒帶菌者的原因爲傳染性病狀，應受有關隔離和舉報疾病患者之管制。財政影響：執行本提案之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，後果可能很不同。假如只使用現有對傳染病類的控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本代表提案必須加強疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

65

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制毒物之排放與警告。禁止排放毒性化學物於食水中，必須發出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定。但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支得由收取的罰款部分抵消。

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承銷$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善開金山市、縣以內的消防系統。

B

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否擴建馬斯康尼會議中心，由重建局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以籌集經費？

C

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的收入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

D

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地資產？

E

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市雇員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 ➡
NO 288 ➡

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios recíprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構員僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualdad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女僱任的工作增加工資?

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的强制退休年齡規定?

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納强制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."



B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.



C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**





D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 57. My occupation is Vice-President, BART Board of Directors, and Business Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: As a Director since 1977, I have worked hard to improve BART, heading committees, and serving as President and Vice President. As a result of my efforts, supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, Senator John Foran, Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maher, and the Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Today BART is America's safest and most reliable transit system. 560 million passenger trips have been made without a patron fatality. On-time performance is 94%.

I have been frugal with public funds. BART's farebox recovery is one of the highest in the industry. Each year the BART property tax rate goes down.

San Francisco receives BART's best service, with clean safe stations, peak trains every 3.5 minutes, and a MUNI/BART pass offering our lowest fare.

I seek reelection to insist upon cost consciousness in all BART operations and to secure better and expanded transit service for San Franciscans.

I am a University of California law graduate, with a Business Administration Masters Degree, and 30 years transportation and business legal experience. My civic activities have included SPUR and San Francisco Strategic Plan-Transportation Task Force. I am a Bay Area native, a homeowner, and a BART-MUNI commuter.

Eugene Garfinkle

JAMES PERON

My occupation is Policy Research Analyst.

My education and qualifications are: It is not difficult to argue that BART is an inefficient system. The necessity for massive tax subsidies is evidence of that. And as long as the subsidies exist, there are no incentives for improvement.

BART must be made into a self-supporting, non-subsidized system. A program to privatize BART must begin immediately, with total privatization as the eventual goal.

The entrepreneurial nature of the free market must be brought in by opening maintenance, service, and other necessary functions to private competitive bidding. Instead of subsidized parking at BART stations, market rates must be charged. And under-utilized space within BART stations should be rented out to merchants.

The taxpayers of the 8th district are unfairly taxed to pay for services that are mostly enjoyed by suburbanites. Payment for BART services should be based on use. Once we have begun the privatization process, the ½% BART sales tax should be abolished.

James Peron

ARLO SMITH

My occupation is Attorney, Transit Advocate, County and State Central Committeemember.

My education and qualifications are: As a practicing Attorney (Hastings College of the Law), elected County Central Committeemember I have been involved in the transportation issues that face San Francisco.

I believe that its time we had a fiscally responsible BART that is interested in questions of basic safety and operations. A system that places the needs of **riders and taxpayers first.**

The present BART Board of Directors has allowed the system to flounder while they voted themselves doubled salaries and lifetime health benefits:

- Irrational fare increases that have caused both ridership and revenues to plummet.
- Escalators and change machines that often don't work.
- Rising BART crime rate.
- Failure to correct life-threatening fire safety hazards despite repeated warnings from Bay Area Fire Chiefs.
- Refusal to meet safety and accessibility standards for handicapped citizens despite receiving Federal funds to make improvements.

As a lifetime user of public transportation I will address these problems. I am accessable at all times to the public at 564-6091.

My supporters include:

- Supervisor John Molinari
- Sheriff Michael Hennessey
- District Attorney Arlo Smith
- Police Officers Association President Bob Barry
- School Board Members Sodonia Wilson, Libby Deneheim, JoAnne Miller, Myra Kopf
- College Board Members Julie Tang, Tim Wolfred
- Planning Commissioner Susan Bierman

Arlo Smith

TOM SPINOSA

My occupation is Controller/Financial Consultant, Auditor, Corporate Officer, State and County Central Committeeman.

My education and qualifications are: Tom Spinosa was appointed by Governor Ronald Reagan to a four year term as State Buildings Standards Commissioner in 1975.

Spinosa has campaigned for:

- Presidents Reagan, Ford, Nixon, Eisenhower.
- Senators Goldwater, Murphy, Hayakawa, Wilson.
- Spinosa is a loyal supporter of Governor George Deukmejian and former Lieutenant Governor Mike Curb.

Tom Spinosa

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO
53	235	236
54	238	239
55	241	242
56	244	245
57	247	248
58	250	251
59	252	253
60	255	256
61	259	260
62	261	262
63	263	264
64	266	267
65	269	270

CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO
A	273	274
B	276	277
C	279	280
D	282	283
E	285	286
F	287	288
G	290	291
H	293	294
I	296	297
J	299	300
K	302	303
M	305	306
N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES	
Governor	
Lt. Governor	
Secretary of State	
Controller	
Treasurer	
Attorney General	
Bd. of Equalization	
U.S. Senate	
U.S. Representative	
State Senate	(If any)
St. Assembly	

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy,** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro**, 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin**, 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci**, 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte**, 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford**, 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon**, 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier**, 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.**, 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk**, 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman**, 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan**, 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston**, 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys**, 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe**, 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau**, 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner**, 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper**, 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry**, 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan**, 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan**, 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia**, 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson**, 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz**, 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz**, 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier**, 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss**, 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte**, 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar**, 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone**, 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin**, 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert**, 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck**, 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo**, 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod**, 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang**, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner**, 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee**, 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee**, 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee**, 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hansee**, 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee**, 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee**, 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li**, 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim**, 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto**, 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren**, 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore**, 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto**, 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino**, 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon**, 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler**, 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor**, 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman**, 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew**, 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth**, 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija**, 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll**, 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo**, 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus**, 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales**, 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green**, 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp**, 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis**, 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay**, 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels**, 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.**, 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray**, 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles**, 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles**, 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth**, 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez**, 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornellus Smith**, 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde**, 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza**, 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker**, 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright**, 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb**, 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., 1 Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez,** 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll,** 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones,** 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice,** 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy,** 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty,** 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman,** 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher,** 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell,** 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Ásians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

MOY VELASQUEZ

My address is 1207 South Van Ness Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/ Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I do believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the community, faculty and administrators whose main responsibility is excellent education for professional/occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing/challenging; therefore, community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Aspiras Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy A. Valasquez are:

John Bulasan, 1524 Waller St., Retired. **Concepcion G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Teacher. **Melandro Busto,** 49 Capp St., Customer Service Representative. **Victoriano G. Busto,** 49 Capp St., Heavy Equipment Mechanic. **Laura Callender,** 868 Shotwell St., Bookkeeper. **James Cubinar,** 391 Munich St., Student. **Lucas E. Eletante,** 105 Whipple Ave., Retired. **Roger Ewald,** 868 Shotwell St., Assistant Operation Manager. **Jeffrey T. Fresnoza,** 60 Esquina Dr., Student. **Samuel F. Magabo,** 2 Cielito Dr., U.S. Army Retired. **Mary Davis Mazyck,** 846 Shotwell St., Teacher. **Carl Nicolas,** 2855 Golden Gate Ave., Retired. **Servillano J. Perlas,** 516 16th Ave., Retired. **Nicerita D. Revelo,** 37 Sheldon St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Beverly L. Reyff,** 49 Devonshire Wy., Teacher. **Dick Ricardo,** 1035 Lincoln Wy., Retired. **Connie H. Rocabo,** 28 Maynard St., Dentist. **Expectacion V. Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Primo Valledor,** 1374 7th Ave., Retired. **Amparo A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Special Ed. Teacher. **Charlemagne A. Velasquez,** 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Antonia A. Villarin,** 36 Harold Ave., Physicians Sec. **Gemma A. Velasquez,** 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Student. **Murdies Washington,** 195 Highland Ave., Para. **Andres G. Ygama,** 250 Kearny St., Retired Seaman.

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street
My occupation is Executive Director
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a M.A. in Social Work. I am the Executive Director of the Chinatown YMCA and am a Board Member of the S.F. Council of Churches.

I have a long history of Civil Rights and am a former Executive Director of Self Help For the Elderly, former staff member of Asian, Inc., and have extensive management skills.

I was appointed by Mayor Feinstein in 1981 and came in first in a Public Election in 1982.

I intend to insure the highest quality of education for all.

Alan S. Wong

The sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Harry G. Britt, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Attorney. **Robert Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv. Educator. **Agnes I. Chan,** 10 Miller Pl., Educator. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Rev. James Chuck,** 2183 40th Ave., Clergy. **Edward dela Cruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Richard Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Ralph Hurtado,** 65 Newburg St., Assistant to Mayor. **Willie Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney, **Norman Leach,** 1471-B 46th Ave., Executive Director. **Melvin D. Lee,** 450 22nd Ave., Commissioner Redevelopment. **William S. Leong,** 1467 12th Ave., Executive Dir. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Jane McKaskle Murphy,** 225 Washington St., Retired. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., City Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Commissioner. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Vu-Duc Vuong,** 2420 Moraga St., Social Worker. **Lloyd Wake,** 295 Hazelwood Ave., Clergyman. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisor. **Doris Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **William Witte,** 2372 Pine St., Govt. Official. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas St., Minister. **Benny Y. Yee,** 351 Marina Blv., Realtor. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

PAUL WOTMAN

My address is 219 States Street
My occupation is Attorney/Small Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Graduate of Columbia University (B.A.) and U.C. Berkeley Boalt Hall (J.D.); Experience with State of California Department of Corporation, prosecutor for Cal/OSHA. Currently in own private law practice, emphasizing small business concerns. Founded an experimental college and taught at a local University.

Education is vitally important to our future. The College Board must set policy, not engage in personal bickering. The Board should lobby for additional funding, develop a Master Plan, set educational goals and demand accountability and manage our current resources more efficiently.

The Board needs new leaders who will end current stagnation and advocate for better education.

Paul Wotman

The sponsors for Paul Wotman are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Willie Brown,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President, Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., SF Community College Board. **Timothy R. Wolfred,** 975 Duncan St., Community College Board Member. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education. **Dr. Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, Member, Board of Education. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Civil Servant. **Joseph P. Driscoll,** 1843 41st Ave., Fire Fighter. **Steven Neuberger,** 3528 19th St., Political-Legislative Director. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Publisher. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains,** 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke,** 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro,** 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti,** 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales,** 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung,** 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.,** 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon,** 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey,** 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton,** 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman,** 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez,** 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang,** 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown,** 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton,** 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley,** 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman,** 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries,** 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.,** 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong,** 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby,** 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino,** 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua,** 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson,** 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman,** 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux,** 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin,** 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride,** 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore,** 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett,** 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce,** 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale,** 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.,** 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng,** 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch,** 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson,** 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn,** 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs,** 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann,** 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang,** 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg,** 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson,** 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz,** 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz,** 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod,** 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler,** 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten,** 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves,** 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator

My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing

B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **B** would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing**.

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything**.

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A Yes vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~.~~**; or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282
NO 283

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Rafil, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE. . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7–2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F.**

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Jack Morrison
Gordon Lau
Bob Gonzales
Terry Francois

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay I

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements

J

PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption



PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 ➡
NO 303 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 ➡
NO 306 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient, and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's high-rise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members
Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE YES ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____

A.V. Prec. No. _____

Ballot Type _____

Affidavit No. _____

Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____

Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____

FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX NUMBER):

_____

DATE OF BIRTH

_____

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT *(DO NOT PRINT)* DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other *means*.

_____

RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS *FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)*

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF: PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of ~~recreation programs~~.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or ~~more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section, or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the ~~two~~ sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

011

19th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District
8th BART District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:

9400's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

SUTRO
SF
R45
#1
11/4/86

19th A.D.
no Senate
5th C.D.
no BART

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

November 4, 1986
General Election

Compiled by

Jay Patterson

Registrar of Voters

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 22 1986

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

012

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

Page
Voting Instructions 18
Sample Ballot 3-17
Your Rights As a Voter 20
Words You Need to Know 19
Handicapped Information 19, 104
Absentee Ballot Application ..... card
Voter Selection Coupon ..... card
Location of Your Polling Place ... 104

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Angela Alioto 21
William Brown, Jr. 21
Raymond Coats 21
Eleanor Calamari Davis 22
Dr. William Gee 22
Dennis John Gianatassio 22
Richard D. Hongisto 23
Andrew "Daddy" Jones 23
Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes 23
Bill Maher 24
Nicole Myers 24
Wendy Nelder 24
Pat Norman 25
A.D. Wyatt Norton 25
Janet Shirley 25
Julie Tang 26
Nancy G. Walker 26
Doris M. Ward 26
Sylvia Weinstein 27

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya 30
Jule C. Anderson 30
Greg Day 30
William Felzer 31
Myra Kopf 31
Gilman Louie 31
Michael Moberg 32
Sodonia M. Wilson, PhD 32
Leland Yee 32

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert E. Burton 28
John Riordan 28
Robert Silvestri 28
Moy Velasquez 29
Alan S. Wong 29
Paul Wotman 29

CANDIDATES FOR BART BOARD (if applicable)

All Candidates 20

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would authorize issuance of $46.2 million in fire protection bonds.

Analysis 33
Arguments 34-38
Legal Text 96

PROPOSITION B

Would authorize financing for Moscone Convention Center expansion.

Analysis 39
Arguments 40-46
Legal Text 46

PROPOSITION C

Would permit refinancing of revenue bonds whenever it would save money.

Analysis 47
Arguments 48
Legal Text 48

PROPOSITION D

Would allow some "Open Space Fund" money to be spent for after-school recreation.

Analysis 49
Arguments 50-55
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION E

Would grant $2 to $50 monthly increase in pensions of retired employees.

Analysis 56
Arguments 57, 58
Legal Text 97

PROPOSITION F

Would allow reciprocal agreements with other California public retirement systems.

Analysis 59
Arguments 60, 61
Legal Text 61

PROPOSITION G

Would allow retirement credit for time served as a union representative, subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 62
Arguments 63
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION H

Would authorize equity pay increases subject to certain conditions.

Analysis 64
Arguments 65-68
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION I

Would change the timeframe for calculating police & fire pay survey.

Analysis 69
Arguments 70-72
Legal Text 98

PROPOSITION J

Would remove age restrictions from police and fire employment.

Analysis 73
Arguments 74
Legal Text 100

PROPOSITION K

Would extend civil service exemption to all art curators.

Analysis 75
Arguments 76
Legal Text 101

PROPOSITION L

Proposition L has been officially removed from the ballot.

PROPOSITION M

Would enact more stringent development controls.

Analysis 77, 78
Arguments 79-93
Legal Text 78

PROPOSITION N

Would enact a two-year ban on crude oil support facilities in the City.

Analysis 94
Arguments 95
Legal Text 95

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Mary Ann Aronson, Bernard Beck and Mary Martin. They were assisted by Tom Owen of the City Attorney's Office.

1

州職位

(GOBERNADOR) 州長

Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian 2
Professor of Economics
Profesor de Economia 經濟學教授

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 4
Governor, State of California
Gobernador, Estado de California 加州州長

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic 6
Mayor, City of Los Angeles
Alcalde, Ciudad de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市市長

MARIA ELIZABETH MUNOZ, Peace and Freedom 8
Educator
Educadora 教育家

GARY V. MILLER, American Independent 10
Governing Board Member, Mt. SAC Comm. College Dist.
Miembro de la Junta de Gobierno Del Colegio Mt. SAC 社區大學校董

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 12

(VICEGOBERNADOR) 副州長

Lieutenant Governor

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 16
College Instructor
Instructor de Colegio Universitario 大學講師

NORMA JEAN ALMODOVAR, Libertarian 18
Author
Autora 作家

JAMES C. "JIM" GRIFFIN, American Independent 20
Truck Driver
Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機

LEO T. McCARTHY, Democratic 22
Lieutenant Governor
Vicegobernador 副州長

MIKE CURB, Republican 24

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 26

1/19
GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
STATE
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
(ESTADO)

(SECRETARIO DE ESTADO) 州務卿
Secretary of State

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

RICHARD WINGER, Libertarian 28
Election Law Consultant
Consultor de Leyes Electorales 選舉法顧問

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent 30
Printer
Impresora 印刷師

BRUCE NESTANDE, Republican 32
County Supervisor
Supervisor del Condado 縣縣參議員

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 34
Secretary of State of California
Secretario de Estado de California 加州州務卿

GLORIA GARCIA, Peace and Freedom 36
Worker
Trabajadora 工人

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 38

(CONTRALOR) 主計官
Controller

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

GRAY DAVIS, Democratic 42
Member of the State Assembly, California Legislature
Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Legislatura de California 加州衆議員

CAROLYN TREYNOR, Libertarian 44
Business Administrator
Administradora de Negocios 商業行政主管

JOHN HAAG, Peace and Freedom 46
Peace/Political Organizer
Organizador Politico/Pacifista 和平／政治活動份子

BILL CAMPBELL, Republican 48
California State Senator
Senador del Estado de California 加州參議員

NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF, American Independent 50
Retired Electrical Director
Director Electrico Retirado 退休電工主任

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does **not** appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 52

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

STATE (ESTADO) 州職位

3

Treasurer (TESORERO) 司庫

請選 1 人 Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MERTON D. SHORT, American Independent Aviator Aviador 飛行家	53
MAUREEN SMITH, Peace and Freedom Union/Community Organizer Organizadora Sindical y Comunitaria 工會／社區組織者	55
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic California State Treasurer Tesorero del Estado de California 加州司庫	56
RAY CULLEN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant Contador Pùblico Certificado 註册公共會計師	58
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	59

(PROCURADOR GENERAL) 司法廳長
Attorney General

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic Attorney General, California Procurado General, California 加州司法廳長	63
GARY R. ODOM, American Independent Attorney Abogado 律師	64
CAROL L. NEWMAN, Libertarian Attorney, Private Practice Abogado, Despacho Propio 私人執業律師	66
ROBERT J. EVANS, Peace and Freedom Lawyer Abogado 律師	67
BRUCE GLEASON, Republican Attorney-at-Law Abogado 律師	69
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	70

(MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE IGUALAMIENTO) 州平準局委員
Member, State Board of Equalization

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

ROBERTO LOVATO, Peace and Freedom Medical Relief Coordinator Coordinador de Auxilios Mèdicos 醫藥救援協調員	74
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic Member, State Board of Equalization, 2nd District Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento 州平準局委員	75
CLAUDE W. PARRISH, Republican Business Executive/Controller Ejecutivo de Negocios/Contralor 商行高級人員／主計員	77
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	78

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
4/19

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(SENADOR DE ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國參議員

United States Senator

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom 81
Socialist Organizer
Organizador Socialista 社會主義組織者

ED ZSCHAU, Republican 83
U.S. Congressman
Congresista Estadounidense 美國衆議員

BRECK McKINLEY, Libertarian 85
Financial Consultant
Consultor Financiero 財務顧問

EDWARD B. "ED" VALLEN, American Independent 87
Director, Patriotic Committee
Director del Comitè Patriòtico

ALAN CRANSTON, Democratic 89
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos 美國參議員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 91

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

(REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS) 美國衆議員

United States Representative

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MIKE GARZA, Republican 96

THEODORE "TED" ZUUR, Peace and Freedom 98
Worker
Trabajador 工人

SALA BURTON, Democratic 100
Representative in Congress 5th District
Diputada en el Congreso 國會衆議員

SAMUEL K. GROVE, Libertarian 102
Electronics Technician
Tècnico en Electrònica 電子技術員

(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated. 104

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986
(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)
5/19-O

STATE SENATOR

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal)

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL) 州衆議員

Member of the State Assembly

請選 1 人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

MICHAEL ROCCO, Republican Corporate Manager Gerente Corporativo 大公司經理	**115** ➡
JACKIE SPEIER, Democratic Member, San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Miembro, Junta de Supervisores del Condado de San Mateo 聖馬刁縣縣參議員	**117** ➡
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does not appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	**119** ➡

JUDICIAL

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **ROSE ELIZABETH BIRD** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 123** ➡ **NO 124** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 126** ➡ **NO 127** ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall **EDWARD A. PANELLI** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	**YES 129** ➡ **NO 130** ➡

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 132 ➡ NO 133 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall STANLEY MOSK be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 135 ➡ NO 136 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT	Shall MALCOLM M. LUCAS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 138 ➡ NO 139 ➡

APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall JOHN W. HOLMDAHL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 141 ➡ NO 142 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION ONE	Shall WILLIAM A. NEWSOM be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 144 ➡ NO 145 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall JOHN ANTHONY KLINE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 147 ➡ NO 148 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall ALLISON MARTIN "AL" ROUSE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 150 ➡ NO 151 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION TWO	Shall JOHN E. BENSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 153 ➡ NO 154 ➡

(APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES, CONTINUED)

FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **JAMES B. SCOTT** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 158 ➡ NO 159 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION THREE	Shall **ROBERT W. MERRILL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 161 ➡ NO 162 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **CARL WEST ANDERSON** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 164 ➡ NO 165 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **M. O. SABRAW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 167 ➡ NO 168 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FOUR	Shall **WILLIAM R. CHANNELL** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 170 ➡ NO 171 ➡
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **HARRY W. LOW** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 173 ➡ NO 174 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **DONALD B. KING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 176 ➡ NO 177 ➡
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE COURT OF APPEAL FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE	Shall **ZERNE P. HANING** be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?	YES 179 ➡ NO 180 ➡

8

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

CITY & COUNTY

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

(CIUDAD Y CONDADO)

8/19

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES) 市參議員

Member, Board of Supervisors

請選最多５人
Vote por no más de 5
Vote for No More than Five

NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	185
DORIS M. WARD Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	186
WILLIAM GEE Dentist/Dentista 牙醫	187
DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO	188
JULIE TANG Assistant District Attorney/Asistente del Fiscal 助理地方檢察官	189
ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS Contract Programming Business Creative Office Services/Programadora de Contratos, Oficina 合約程序商務創新服務	190
PAT NORMAN Health Services Manager, SF Health Dept./Administradora de Servicios de Salud 舊金山公共衛生局衛生服務主任	191
A. D. (WYATT) NORTON Artist/Artista 藝術家	192
WENDY NELDER Incumbent/En posesión del cargo 現任市參議員	193
NICOLE MYERS 小商人及鄰里事務倡導者 Small Business Owner and Neighborhood Advocate/Dueño de Negocios Pequeños y Promotor en Negocios de la Vecindad	194
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	195
JANET SHIRLEY Independent Business Woman/Comerciante Independiente 獨立女商人	196
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Party of Life/Celebremos la Vida 生活黨	197
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員	198
ANDREW "DADDY" JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminologia 犯罪學學生	199
RAYMOND COATS Owner, Super Carpet Cleaning/Propietario de Super Carpet Cleaning 超級地毯清潔公司老闆	200
ANGELA ALIOTO Doctor of Law/Businesswoman/Doctora en Leyes/Comerciante 法學博士／女商人	201
WILLIAM BROWN, JR.	202
SYLVIA WEINSTEIN Socialist Activist/Activista Socialista 社會主義行動	203
(WRITE-IN:) To vote for a candidate whose name does <u>not</u> appear on the ballot, please refer to the posted instructions. Do not vote for more candidates than the number indicated.	204

DO NOT VOTE FOR
MORE THAN FIVE CANDIDATES
FOR SUPERVISOR

9

GENERAL ELECTION
NOVEMBER 4, 1986

(ELECCION GENERAL)
(4 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1986)

9/19-O-6/6

SCHOOL (ESCOLAR)

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE EDUCACION) 教育委員
Member, Board of Education

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

JULE C. ANDERSON Educator/Educadora 教育家	210 ➡
ROSARIO ANAYA Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任教育委員	211 ➡
SODONIA WILSON 舊金山教育委員／大學行政主管 Commissioner, SF Board of Education; College Administrator/Comisionada, Consejo de Educaciòn; Administradora de Colegio Universitario	212 ➡
GREG DAY Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios para Jovenes 青少年服務主任	213 ➡
LELAND YEE Parent/Educator/Padre/Educador 家長／教育家	214 ➡
MICHAEL MOBERG MBA, CPA/ 商業管理碩士、註册公共會計師	215 ➡
MYRA KOPF President, SF School Board/Presidente, Consejo de Educaciòn 舊金山教育局主席	216 ➡
GILMAN LOUIE Computer Corporation President/Presidente de Corporaciòn de Computadoras 電腦公司總裁	217 ➡
WILLIAM FELZER Teacher/Engineer/Maestro/Ingeniero 教師／工程師	218 ➡

(MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD) 社區大學校董
Member, Community College Board

請選最多 3 人
Vote por no más de 3
Vote for No More than Three

PAUL WOTMAN Attorney/Small Businessman/Abogado/Comerciante 律師 小商人	222 ➡
MOY VELASQUEZ Educator/Educador 教育家	223 ➡
ROBERT SILVESTRI Educator/Educador 教育家	224 ➡
JOHN RIORDAN Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	225 ➡
ROBERT E. BURTON Member, SF Community College Board/Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad 舊金山社區大學校董	226 ➡
ALAN S. WONG Incumbent/En posesiòn del cargo 現任社區大學校董	227 ➡

DISTRICT/DISTRITO

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR DISTRICT DIRECTOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Junta Directiva)

53 GREENE-HUGHES SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) per year.

YES 235 →
NO 236 →

54 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for the acquisition and construction of state youth and adult correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

YES 238 →
NO 239 →

55 CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.

YES 241 →
NO 242 →

56 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1986. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred million dollars ($400,000,000) to provide capital for construction or improvement of facilities at California's public higher education institutions, including the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 19 campuses, the California Community College's 106 campuses, and the California Maritime Academy, to be sold at a rate not to exceed two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) per year.

YES 244 →
NO 245 →

57 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. Precludes basing retirement benefits of certain state constitutional officers on compensation payable to their successors. Fiscal impact: Would result in an annual state saving of about $400,000 by preventing the automatic increase of future retirement benefits of fewer than 20 people when salaries of statewide elected officers increase in the future.

YES 247 →
NO 248 →

58 TAXATION. FAMILY TRANSFERS. Exempts transfers of real property between spouses and between parents and children from property tax reassessment. Fiscal impact: Would reduce local property tax revenues. Local governments would lose about $17 million in 1987-88, $37 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future. School and community college districts would lose about $11 million in 1987-88, $23 million in 1988-89, and increasing amounts in future, but state aid would offset these losses, resulting in a loss to the State General Fund in those amounts.

YES 250 →
NO 251 →

59 ELECTED DISTRICT ATTORNEY. Requires office of county district attorney to be elective. Fiscal impact: Measure would have no direct state or local fiscal effect.

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

60 TAXATION. REPLACEMENT RESIDENCES. Legislature may permit homeowners over 55 who change residences to keep assessment under certain conditions. Fiscal impact: Measure has no direct state or local effect unless the Legislature passes laws implementing it. If the Legislature does so, property tax revenues would be reduced. Loss of revenue would probably amount to several million dollars per year. Local governments would bear 60 percent of loss, community colleges and school districts the balance. The State General Fund would offset loss to community colleges and school districts through higher state aid.

YES 255 →
NO 256 →

61 PUBLIC OFFICIAL, EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR COMPENSATION. Limits compensation of state and local public officials, employees and individual contractors. Fiscal Impact: Net fiscal impact is unknown. This measure would result in unknown savings to state and local governments estimated to be about $125 million in the first year at state level and roughly the same at local level. These savings, however, could be offset and could even be outweighted by the need to pay vested sick and vacation leave at a one-time cost of about $7 billion.

YES 259 →
NO 260 →

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

235 SI 贊成
236 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS GREENE-HUGHES DE 1986 PARA LA COMPRA-ARRIENDO DE EDIFICIOS ESCOLARES. Esta ley permite una emisión de bonos con valor de ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para poder financiar la construcción y mejoras de las escuelas públicas. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) al año.

一九八六年格林—休斯校舍租購公債法案。本提案規定發行公債八億元（$800,000,000）作爲興建及改善公校之貸金開支，每年出售的公債不能超過四億元（$400,000,000）。

53

238 SI 贊成
239 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES. Esta ley permite la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones correccionales estatales para jóvenes y adultos por medio de la emisión de bonos con valor de quinientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000).

一九八六年監獄新設公債法案。本提案規定發行公債五億元（$500,000,000），提供貸金用於購買和建築青少年及成人州監獄。

54

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA HACER MAS SEGURA EL AGUA POTABLE EN CALIFORNIA. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cien millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para financiar mejoras en los sistemas domésticos de agua para satisfacer las normas mínimas de seguridad del agua potable.

一九八六年加州安全食水公債法案。本提案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供貸金用於改善家用供水系統以符合最低食水標準。

55

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

LEY DE EMISION DE BONOS DE 1986 PARA FINANCIAR MEJORAS EN LAS UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS COLEGIOS SUPERIORES. Esta ley permite la emisión de bonos con valor de cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoras en las instalaciones de los instituciones públicas de educación superior en California, incluyendo las nueve localidades de la Universidad de California, las 19 localidades de California State University (Universidad Estatal de California), los 106 Colegios comunitarios del Estado de California, y la Academia Marítima de California. Los bonos no podrán ser vendidos en cantidades mayores de doscientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($250,000,000) al año.

一九八六年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案規定發行公債四億元（$400,000,000），提供貸金用於爲加州的公共高等教育機構興建或改善設施，包括加州大學的九個校園、加州州立大學的十九個校園、加州的一〇六個社區大學校園以及加州海事學院。每年出售的公債不能超過二億五千萬元。

56

247 SI 贊成
248 NO 反對

BENEFICIOS DE JUBILACION PARA FUNCIONARIOS CONSTITUCIONALES. Prohibe basar los beneficios de jubilación de ciertos funcionarios constitucionales del Estado en la compensación que será pagada a sus sucesores. Impacto fiscal: Resultaría en ahorros anuales de $400,000 para el Estado, al evitar el aumento automático de futuros beneficios de jubilación de menos de 20 personas cuando los salarios de funcionarios electos en el Estado aumentan en el futuro.

憲法法定人員之退休福利。取消根據任者的薪酬來決定某些州憲法法定人員的退休福利的規定。財政影響：防止爲未當全州性民選官員加薪時，不足二十個人的退休福利相應增加，爲州節省開支$400,000。

57

250 SI 贊成
251 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE TRANSFERENCIAS FAMILIARES. Exime las transferencias de bienes raíces entre esposos y entre padres e hijos del requerimiento de una reevaluación para efectos de impuestos sobre dichas propiedades. Impacto fiscal: Reduciría los ingresos locales debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad. Los gobiernos locales perderían cerca de $17 millones en 1987-88, $37 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Los distritos escolares y colegios comunitarios perderían cerca de $11 millones en 1987-88, $23 millones en 1988-89, y cantidades aún mayores en el futuro. Sin embargo, la ayuda económica estatal compensaría estas pérdidas, lo que resultaría en una pérdida para el Fondo General del Estado igual a las cantidades mencionadas anteriormente.

稅稅，家庭財產轉讓。豁免配偶之間以及父母與子女之間轉讓之實業於重新估值。財政影響：將減少地方物業稅收入。地方政府一九八七至八八年將損失的一千七百萬元，一九八八至八九年損失三千七百萬元。數額以後每年遞增，州政府的援助將抵銷地方上的損失。但州普通基金將承納上述數額的損失。

58

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對

ELECCION DEL FISCAL PUBLICO. Requiere que el cargo de Fiscal Público de los condados sea electivo. Impacto fiscal: Esta proposición no tendrá ningún impacto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal.

民選地方檢察官。規定各縣的地方檢察官必須經選舉產出。財政影響：對州及地方政府並無直接財政影響。

59

255 SI 贊成
256 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS SOBRE EL CAMBIO DE RESIDENCIAS. La Asamblea Legislativa del Estado podrá permitir que los propietarios de casa de más de 55 años de edad que cambien su residencia puedan mantener el mismo gravamen bajo ciertas condiciones. Impacto fiscal: La proposición no tiene ningún efecto fiscal directo de tipo local o estatal a menos que la Asamblea Legislativa apruebe leyes poniéndola en vigor. Si la Asamblea lo hace, los ingresos debidos a impuestos sobre la propiedad serían reducidos. La pérdida de ingresos probablemente alcanzaría la cifra de varios millones de dólares por año. Los gobiernos locales sufrirían el 60 por ciento de esta pérdida, y los distritos escolares y Colegios comunitarios el resto. El Fondo General del Estado compensaría la pérdida de los Colegios de la Comunidad y de los distritos escolares con una mayor ayuda económica estatal.

房稅，替代住宅。州議會可容許五十五歲以上的業民在特定情況下更換住宅而保持原有住宅的估值。財政影響：除非州議會通過法例以實施本提案，否則從事對州及地方政府收稅有機財政影響。若州議會通過實施本提案的法例，按業稅收入將會減少，每年損失的收入將達數百萬元。地方政府將承擔百分之六十的損失，社區大學和公校區將承擔其餘損失。州政府將由普通基金撥出民助金補償社區大學和公校區的損失。

60

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對

COMPENSACION DE FUNCIONARIOS Y EMPLEADOS PUBLICOS Y CONTRATISTAS. Limita la compensación pagada a funcionarios y empleados públicos y a contratistas individuales. Impacto fiscal: El impacto fiscal neto es desconocido. Esta proposición resultaría en ahorros para los gobiernos locales y estatal estimados en cerca de $125 millones en el primer año al nivel estatal, y aproximadamente la misma cantidad a nivel local. Estos ahorros podrían ser reducidos y aún hasta eleminados por la necesidad de pagar todos los días de enfermedad y vacaciones acumulados. Este requerimiento resultaría en un costo, a ser pagado todo de una vez, de cerca de $7 billones.

官員，公共雇員，承包人之薪酬。限制付給官員，公共僱員和個別公務承包人之薪酬。財政影響：最終財政影響未知。本提案將爲州及地方政府節省數額未知的開費。估計州及地方第一年可省開約一億二千五百萬元。但開省的經費可能因必須補償既有病假和休假假期的七十億元而抵銷，支出甚至可能超出節省數額。

61

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

62 LOCAL TAXATION. For new and increased taxes, local governments and districts need two-thirds popular vote—special taxes; majority—general taxes. Fiscal impact: Prevents new or higher general taxes by local agencies without voter approval. Could reduce local agencies' existing tax revenues, if their voters do not ratify the continuation of new or higher taxes adopted after August 1, 1985. Provisions imposing penalties and requiring voter approval cannot be applied to charter cities.

YES 261 ➡
NO 262 ➡

63 OFFICIAL STATE LANGUAGE. Requires Legislature and state officials to ensure English as official state common language. Provides for private enforcement. Fiscal impact: No direct effect on the costs or revenues of the state or local governments.

YES 263 ➡
NO 264 ➡

64 ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS). Declares AIDS virus carrier a contagious condition, subject to quarantine and reportable disease regulation. Fiscal impact: The measure's cost could vary greatly depending upon its interpretation by health officers and courts. If existing discretionary communicable disease controls were applied to AIDS, given the current state of medical knowledge, there would be no substantial change in state and local costs. If measure were interpreted to require added disease controls, costs could range to hundreds of millions of dollars per year depending on measures taken.

YES 266 ➡
NO 267 ➡

65 TOXIC DISCHARGE AND EXPOSURE RESTRICTIONS. Prohibits discharge of toxic chemicals into drinking water and requires warnings of toxic chemicals exposure. Fiscal impact: Costs of state and local enforcement are estimated at $500,000 in 1987 and thereafter would depend on many factors, but could exceed $1,000,000 annually. Costs would be partially offset by fines collected.

YES 269 ➡
NO 270 ➡

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273 ➡
NO 274 ➡

B Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

C Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

D Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

E Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

IMPUESTOS LOCALES. Para crear nuevos impuestos o aumentarlos, los gobiernos locales y distritos necesitan las dos terceras partes del voto popular (impuestos especiales), o una mayoría (impuestos generales). Impacto fiscal: Evitaría nuevos o más altos impuestos generales por agencias locales sin la aprobación de los electores. Podría reducir los presentes ingresos por concepto de impuestos de las agencias locales, si los electores no ratifican la continuación de nuevos o más altos impuestos adoptados después del 1 ro. de Agosto de 1985. Las provisiones que imponen multas y que requieren la aprobación del electorado no pueden ser aplicadas a ciudades con Constitución.

地方課稅。地方政府及行政區若要徵收新的特別稅或加稅，必須得選民三分之二票數通過，徵收新普通稅或加稅，則須得選民多數票通過。財政影響：阻止地方機構未徵選民通過而徵收新稅或增稅。如果選民不追認一九八五年八月一日以後生效的新稅或增稅，地方現有稅收可能減少。有關強制和須得選民通過的規定將不適用於特許城市。

62

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

IDIOMA OFICIAL DEL ESTADO. Requiere que la Asamblea Legislativa y los funcionarios del Estado aseguren que el inglés es el idioma común oficial del Estado. Permite la acción privada para hacer cumplir la ley. Impacto fiscal: No tiene ningún efecto directo en los costos o ingresos de los gobiernos locales o estatal.

州官方語言。規定州議會及州官員必須保障英語爲州的官方通用語言。制定私人方面執行本提案的辦法。財政影響：對州及地方政府的收支並無直接影響。

63

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對

SINDROME DE DEFICIENCIA ADQUIRIDA DE INMUNIDAD (AIDS). Declara que el portar o tener el virus de AIDS es una condición contagiosa y sujeta a las regulaciones de cuarentena y de reporte de enfermedades. Impacto fiscal: El costo de esta proposición variaría grandemente dependiendo de su interpretación por los funcionarios sanitarios y por las cortes de justicia. Si se aplicaran a AIDS los controles discrecionales existentes para enfermedades contagiosas, teniendo en cuenta el presente estado de conocimientos médicos, no habría un cambio substancial en los costos locales y del estado. Si la proposición es interpretada como que requiere controles adicionales para la enfermedad, los costos podrían alcanzar cientos de millones de dólares por año, dependiendo de las medidas que se tomaran.

後天免疫力消失綜合症（愛滋病）。實施愛滋病毒帶菌者的放及爲傳染性病狀。應受有關隔離和舉報疾病條例之管制。財政影響：執行本條例之成本視乎公共衛生官員和法庭如何解釋本提案，倘果可能再然不同。假如以現用有對傳染病用的控制的辦法對待愛滋病，在目前醫學知識基礎上作估計，本提案對州及地方政府的開支不會有直接影響。假如本提案被解釋爲必須加强疾病控制，則視乎各項措施的範圍，每年成本可達數億元。

64

269 SI 贊成
270 NO 反對

RESTRICCIONES SOBRE DESCARGAS Y EXPOSICION A SUBSTANCIAS TOXICAS. Prohibe la descarga de substancias químicas tóxicas en el agua potable y requiere advertencia acerca de la exposición a substancias químicas tóxicas. Impacto fiscal: Los costos para hacer cumplir esta ley a nivel local y estatal se estiman en $500,000 en 1987. Después de esta fecha, los costos dependerían de muchos factores pero podrían exceder la cantidad anual de $1,000,000. Los costos serían reducidos parcialmente por las multas que fueran impuestas.

限制廢物之排放與曝露。禁止排放毒性化學物於食水中，必須警出有關曝露於毒性化學物的警告。財政影響：州及地方政府一九八七年執行本措施的開支估計約爲$500,000，此後開支因多種因素而定，但每年可能超過一百萬元。開支將由收取的罰款部分抵消。

65

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAS EN EL SISTEMA DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS, 1986. Para emitir bonos con valor total de $46,200,000 para mejoras del sistema de protección contra incendios dentro de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco.

改善消防系統公債，承擔$46,200,000的受保公債，提供資金改善舊金山市、縣以內的消防系統。

A

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

¿ Deberá construir la Ciudad adiciones al Centro de Convenciones Moscone, a ser financiadas por bonos de ingresos de arrendamiento a ser emitidos por la Agencia de Reedificación (Redevelopment Agency) con un valor que no exceda la cantidad de $140,000,000?

市政府應否興建爲斯摩尼會議中心，由票據局發行不超過$140,000,000的租賃收入公債以資集資？

B

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad recibir autorización para emitir nuevos bonos de ingresos sin el voto del electorado para pagar bonos existentes a un costo más bajo para la Ciudad?

應否授權市政府不必經選民同意而發行新的歲入公債，以較低成本籌集資金償還現有公債？

C

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

¿ Deberá usar la ciudad por lo menos el 12% de sus fondos de terrenos baldíos para programas de recreo despues de las clases de las escuelas, y por lo menos el 45% para la compra y desarrollo de propiedades baldíos ó espacios abiertos?

市政府應否使用最少百分之十二的露天場地基金於課餘活動計劃，及最少百分之四十五於購買和發展露天場地實業？

D

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿ Deberá aumentar la ciudad la cantidad mensual asignada a los empleados de la cuidad que se jubilaron antes de Junio de 1961 por $50, y a aquellos que se jubilaron desdes entonces en una cantidad proporcional?

市政府應否給予一九六一年六月以後退休的市僱員每月增加退休金五十元，以及給予在此日期後的退休者按比例增加金額？

E

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287 →
NO 288 →

G Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 →
NO 291 →

H Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 →
NO 294 →

I Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 →
NO 297 →

J Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 →
NO 300 →

K Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302 →
NO 303 →

Proposition L was removed from the ballot.

M Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305 →
NO 306 →

N Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 →
NO 309 →

END OF BALLOT

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES

287 SI 贊成
288 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para participar con otras agencias públicas en un sistema de "beneficios reciprocos de jubilación" para sus trabajadores bajo la ley estatal?

應否授權市政府聯同其他公共機構爲僱員加入州法例管轄下的"互惠退休金"制度?

F

290 SI 贊成
291 NO 反對

¿ Deberá la Ciudad permitir que representantes laborales reciban beneficios de jubilación por el tiempo que se ausenten de sus cargos en la municipalidad para representar a los trabajadores de la ciudad?

市政府應否容許工會代表從市政職位請假以進行代表市僱員的活動而獲得退休福利?

G

293 SI 贊成
294 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para que otorgue aumentos de salario a trabajadores de la ciudad en cargos que sean desproporcionadamente ocupados por minorías y mujeres, de acuerdo con una encuesta anual de igualidad en el salario?

應否授權市政府根據週年工資公平調查的結果，爲某些不相稱地大部分由少數民族和婦女擔任的工作增加工資?

H

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿ Deberá ser autorizada la Ciudad para ajustar los salarios de los departamentos de policía y bomberos después de la adopción de la evaluación anual de salarios para incluir salarios adoptados en otras ciudades después de esa fecha?

應否授權市政府在採納週年薪酬調查後調整警員及消防員薪酬，以包括其他城市在該日期後採納的工資額?

I

299 SI 贊成
300 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eliminar la Ciudad los límites de edad máxima para las personas que ingresan en los departamentos de policía y bomberos, y eliminar las edades obligatorias de jubilación en los departamentos de policía y bomberos?

市政府應否取消對進入警局及消防局工作者的最高年齡限制，並取消警局和消防局的強制退休年齡規定?

J

302 SI 贊成
303 NO 反對

¿ Deberá eximir la Ciudad a todos los curadores o encargados de objectos de arte del sistema de servicio civil?

市政府應否豁免所有藝術管理員於市公務制度之外?

K

La proposición L fue eliminada de la balota

305 SI 贊成
306 NO 反對

¿ Deberá adoptar la Ciudad una política obligatoria de prioridad para su Plan Maestro, extender los límites sobre el desarrollo de nuevos edificios de oficinas en San Francisco, y reducir la cantidad de nuevas oficinas permitida bajo el Plan del Centro de la Ciudad?

市政府應否爲本市"總體規劃"採納強制性優先措施，增加對在舊金山興建的新辦公樓的限制，以及減少"商業區規劃"所容許的新辦公樓面積?

M

308 SI 贊成
309 NO 反對

¿ Deberá imponer la Ciudad una moratoria de dos años en todos los permisos para el desarrollo de instalaciones para el proceso y operaciones asociadas con el proceso de petróleo crudo y gas dentro de San Francisco?

市政府應否停止發給准照在舊金山以內發展原油和煤氣的加工及支持設施?

N

FINAL DE LA BALOTA

HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

如何用自動投票機

A 請特別注意
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Nota: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."



B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.



C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). **PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH** THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. **DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.**

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. **No use pluma ni lápiz.**





D 第三步
請把帶鍊之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE **POCKET**, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Despues de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—An official list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot by writing to the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLING PLACE—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1.

MEASURE—Another name for proposition.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

SUPERVISORS—Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT—The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE—A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY—A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, the supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,332 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change it. An initiative Charter amendment needs 22,834 signatures.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PERMIT (noun)—A document issued by the City which allows one to do a particular act, such as construct a building.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT—A development agreement is an ordinance which provides that a particular project may be developed according to the rules and policies governing land use and construction in force at the time of the agreement, even if those rules and policies later change.

BONDS—If the City needs money to pay for something such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest. There are two kinds of bonds:

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or fees charged to users of the water system). The decision to sell most types of revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.
2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).
3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. When you apply for an absentee ballot you will receive an application for permanent absentee voter status.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 6, 1986.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. Citizen,
- are at least 18 years of age on election day,
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 554-4397. You will be sent a form.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you "Decline to State." At this election it doesn't matter what party you belong to.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election or a local election you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot. At a primary election, you can only choose among the candidates of your party. This election is a general election.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, State Board of Equalization, U.S. Senator, U.S. Congressmember, State Senator, State Assemblymember, BART Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, School and College Boards. Supreme Court justices and justices of the courts of appeal will also be on the ballot for a "yes" or a "no" vote.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your polling place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you. If they can't help you, call 554-4380.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 4, 1986. Your polling place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 554-4380.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in". If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

Q—Can a worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—Is it true that I can take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, you can have up to two hours off provided (1) that you actually need it and would otherwise be unable to vote and (2) that you inform your employer at least three working days in advance.

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—An application form is not necessary. You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:

- your home address,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 4, 1986.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS.

VOTER SELECTION CARD

(continued)

Supervisor

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

(4)_____

(5)_____

Board of Education

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

Comm. College Board

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____

BART Board (if any)

(1)_____

Circle the number corresponding to your choice. This number will appear on your ballot.

STATE PROPOSITIONS			CITY PROPOSITIONS		
	YES	NO		YES	NO
53	235	236	A	273	274
54	238	239	B	276	277
55	241	242	C	279	280
56	244	245	D	282	283
57	247	248	E	285	286
58	250	251	F	287	288
59	252	253	G	290	291
60	255	256	H	293	294
61	259	260	I	296	297
62	261	262	J	299	300
63	263	264	K	302	303
64	266	267	M	305	306
65	269	270	N	308	309

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M

VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES
Governor _____
Lt. Governor _____
Secretary of State _____
Controller _____
Treasurer _____
Attorney General _____
Bd. of Equalization _____
U.S. Senate _____
U.S. Representative _____
State Senate _____ (If any)
St. Assembly _____

Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

JUDGES		
SUPREME COURT	YES	NO
	123	124
	126	127
	129	130
	132	133
	135	136
	138	139
COURT OF APPEAL		
	141	142
	144	145
	147	148
	150	151
	153	154
	158	159
	161	162
	164	165
	167	168
	170	171
	173	174
	176	177
	179	180

(Continued on Reverse Side)

Candidates for Supervisor

ANGELA ALIOTO

My address is 2606 Pacific Avenue
My occupation is Doctor of Law/ Businesswoman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Enough is enough—it's time for a change on the Board of Supervisors. We must preserve and protect our neighborhoods and make Downtown pay its fair share of the city's costs. We must make a true commitment to affordable housing, especially for the elderly. We must insure that there is enough money, properly spent, for AIDS/ARC research and education. And we must make sure that the Board regains its credibility and values. I will bring a sense of responsibility, a sense of compassion, and just plain sense to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you for your vote.

Angela Alioto

The Sponsors for Angela Alioto are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ann Mussallem Alioto,** 2801 Octavia St., Real Estate. **Joseph L. Alioto,** 2501 Pacific Ave., Attorney-At-Law. **Russ Alley,** 150 Corwin St., Producer. **Merl O. Barns,** 830 Bush St., Attorney. **Adrian Bermudez, Jr.,** 328 Peninsula Ave., Health Technician. **Gaetano (Gino) Biradelli,** 700 Columbus Ave., Pasta & Gelato Manufacturer. **Douglas Boucher,** 2200 Pacific Ave., President, Determined Prod. **Roger Cardenas,** 34 Liberty St., Self-Employed. **Ethel V. Chester,** 432 Gold Mine Dr., Housewife. **Tina Burgess Coan,** 59 Chabot Ter., Housewife. **Sandra Findorff,** 120 Randall St., Catering. **Janice R. Halder,** 1000 Green St., Corporate Psychologist. **Anthony P. Hall,** 20 Rockaway Ave., Entertainer. **John Holtzclaw,** 1508 Taylor St., Urban Consultant. **Jesse J. Ivy,** 2734 Bush St., Deputy Sheriff. **Robert L. Landis,** 44 Entrada Ct., Teacher. **Modesto Lanzone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Restaurant Owner. **Norman T. Larson,** 557-B Ashbury St., Real Estate Investor. **Hubert (Bert) Levenson,** 2630 Laguna St., M.D. **Cyril Magnin,** One Nob Hill Cir., Executive. **Clemente Newball-Obregon,** 3060 California St., Economist. **Gavin Payne,** 135 Red Rock Wy., Consultant. **Nancy Pelosi,** 40 Presidio Ter., Houseperson. **Jo Schuman,** 1170 Sacramento St., Designer. **Michael D. Shaw,** 681 Fell St., Deputy Director. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Hotel Management. **Susan Willis,** 991 Innes Ave., Retired. **Richard J. Zee,** 24 Annapolis Ter., Insurance Broker.

WILLIAM BROWN, JR.

My address is 2310 Powell Street

My qualifications for office are: Many of you are familiar with my work for San Francisco with the California State Government. Here, I wish to focus on what has been and is my, and most citizens concern for San Francisco—the preservation, of the character, of our neighborhoods. I have and will continue to support Mayor Diane Feinstein's and Supervisor John Molinari's plans for preserving small neighborhood business and housing. I believe my experience with government, business and property interests in the downtown and neighborhood districts make me uniquely qualified to represent the citizens of the now most livable city in the world.

William Brown, Jr.

The sponsors for William Brown, Jr. are:

Michelle Boykins, 1398 Shafter Ave., Reservation Agent. **Mark Joseph Brunner,** 1614 Vallejo St., Real Estate. **P. J. Carcamo,** 3839 24th St., Graphic Designer. **Charles M. Cunningham,** 475 Connecticut St., Manufacturer Sports Wear. **Joseph L. Espil,** 2584 22nd Ave., Garage Attendant. **Brian Feagins,** 481-½ Sanchez St., Key Puncher. **Elizabeth Hanson,** 245 North Point St., Retired Legal Secretary. **Rose Houghton,** 301 Moultrie St., Clerk. **Lai Chong Hwang,** 1437 Polk St., North Beach Merchant. **Teodorica B. Lasola,** 1171 Cayuga Ave., Bookkeeper. **Dirksen De-Shen Liu,** 507 12th Ave., Bartender. **Jeffrey O. McCarthy,** 626 Pine St., Car Rental Management. **Mary Moehle,** 141 Caselli Ave., Art Director. **David W. Nemir,** 2310 Powell St., Banker. **Mary M. C. Ng,** 120 Wetmore St., Computer Products Buyer. **Fred Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Computer Communications Researcher. **Judith Ostapik,** 160 Manor Dr., Accountant. **Mary Jo Saeed,** 445 Hugo St., Florist. **Jan Spalding,** 260 Bay St., Clerk-Typist. **Warren Q. Seeto,** 1445 Hyde St., Mortgage Officer. **Daniel R. Toomey,** 2929 Buchanan St., Police Officer. **Helen K. Vaughn,** 51 Dedman Ct., Asset Manager. **Roderick V. Wallace,** 220 Charter Oak Ave., Cashier. **George Weaver,** 165 North Point St., Apartment Maintenance.

RAYMOND COATS

My address is 419 Garfield Street
My occupation is Carpet Cleaner
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am a small business owner, into carpet cleaning, residential and janitorial service. The son of Curtis Coats Sr. of San Francisco, married and active in Churches of Christ as an Evangelist.

I attended Jededia Smith, James Denman and Balboa. I attended San Jose State, and worked with former Supervisor Lee Dolson. My father organized the OceanView, Merced and Ingelside Association. I received a grant to restore OceanView Playground. I am deeply interested in, and have worked to solve drug abuse and joblessness in San Francisco and pledge to work more effectively as a San Francisco Supervisor.

Raymond Coats

The sponsors for Raymond Coats are:

Lewis M. Allen, 36 Borica St., Minister. **Warren L. Baxter,** 245 Hester Ave., Recreation. **Joseph W. Davis,** 88 Ralston St. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Linda J. Edgar,** 30 Thrift St., Labor. **G. R. Furlough,** 479 Orizaba Ave., Barber. **B. E. Harris,** 900 McAllister St., Deacon. **Jeri Jackson,** 2637 22nd St., Recreation. **Lewis Jackson,** 288 Broad St., Custodian. **Terri Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Housewife. **Timmy Knight,** 235 St. Charles St., Carpenter. **Joseph Lett,** 232 Tara St., Retired. **Jasper Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Retired. **Louise Lewis,** 166 Bright St., Merchant. **Carol A. McGinty,** 536 Munich St., Cashier. **David Mitchell,** 566 Yale St., Gardener Supervisor. **Louise M. Nobles,** 235 Orizaba Ave., Clerk-Typist. **Will Henry Reno,** 2834 San Jose Ave., Barber. **Gladys M. Robinson,** 244 Grafton St., Retired. **Ennis Sandle,** 17 Broad St., Retired. **Rosalie Smith,** 276 Sagamore St., Homemaker. **Alfred Strickland, Sr.,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaners. **Earlene Strickland,** 245 Minerva St., Dry Cleaning. **Leroy Stumps, Jr.,** 43 Brighton Ave., Merchant. **Oranza Wiley,** 925 Capitol St., Merchant.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accur[illegible]

Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR CALAMARI DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Contract Consulting Company
My qualifications for office are: My experience with City Hall, neighborhoods, downtown, community groups is extensive. As a non incumbent, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making government respond to our needs.

Supported: Affordable housing, Equal pay, Protecting quality of life in neighborhoods, Crime-reducing patrols to protect seniors, S.F. Can, Job creation youth programs.

Chaired/Served on and Initiated Programs For: Merchant Associations, Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's, Sidewalk Vending, Parking, Narcotics Task Forces, YMCA, Alcohol/Drug Services, S.F. Outlook, SFSU Public Research Institute.

With your support I will work to bring together all diverse viewpoints of San Francisco.

Eleanor Calamari Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor Calamari Davis are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyperson. **Susan Brady Alfaro,** 1812 Webster St., Graphic Designer. **David D. Ardoin,** 899 Brussels St., Elevator Constructor. **Robert B. Bacci,** 2478 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Luis A. Belmonte,** 250 Walnut St., Developer. **Jack Casford,** 1811 Leavenworth St., Civil Servant. **Frances A. Condon,** 2506 21st Ave., Housewife. **Kathleen Cormier,** 321 Richland Ave., Writer. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Belle Falk,** 1000 Green St., Investor. **Rick Hauptman,** 1595 Noe St., Computer Manager. **Robert L. Hogan,** 3975 Clay St., Consultant. **Jennifer C. Houston,** 22 Delgado St., Consultant. **Henrietta Odell Humphreys,** 3401 Clay St., Financial Advisor. **Walter G. Jebe,** 314 Polaris Wy., Businessman. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Richard N. Lerner,** 67 Wawona St., Consultant. **Leroy Looper,** 827 Guerrero St., Director. **Richard William Lowry,** 2235 47th Ave., Consultant. **John J. Noonan,** 1075 Folsom St., Photo-Engraver. **Linda M. Radigan,** 1684 12th Ave., PR/Communications. **William J. Rapaglia,** 2090 Green St., Developer. **Linda M. Robertson,** 3975 Clay St., Writer/Producer. **Nancy Scheinholtz,** 2340 Pacific Ave., Architect. **Daniel Schultz,** 4199 24th St., President Carpenters. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Helen Hale Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Magie Sonier,** 4388 17th St., Social Worker. **Donald N. Strauss,** 123 Lake St., Accountant.

WILLIAM L. GEE

My address is 606 15th Avenue
My occupation is Dentist
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of UCSF, a City public health dentist for 26 years with a private practice as well. I have lived, worked, and raised a family in San Francisco. I helped On Lok Senior Health Services and North East Medical Services get started and I was president of the San Francisco Commission on Aging. San Francisco should remain one of world's great cities for those who live here and not become merely a playground for those who visit or invest or commute here. Education, housing, health care, safety, and equal opportunity are my highest priorities and I know how to achieve them.

William L. Gee

The sponsors for William L. Gee are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Charles F. Butte,** 890 34th Ave., Programmer Analyst. **R.C. Caesar,** 150 Topeka St., Dentist. **Leroy D. Cagnone,** 601 Van Ness Ave., Dental Educator. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director. **Jack W. Colbert,** 250 Tara St., Fund Raiser. **Harry V. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Minister. **Jerome G. DeFilippo,** 610 15th Ave., Retired. **Doreen Der-McLeod,** 327 20th Ave., Social Worker. **James Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist. **Eva Y. Gardner,** 333 9th Ave., Community Organizer. **Alfred Gee,** 17 Heather Ave., Insurance Broker. **Kathleen A. Gee,** 606 15th Ave., Nurse. **Thomas H. Gee,** 173 Anza Vista Ave., Retired. **Jennie Chin Hanse,** 434 31st Ave., Administrator. **Gilbert S. Lee,** 762 33rd Ave., Physician. **Harry Lee,** 155 Alton Ave., Physician. **Jonah G. Li,** 119 Mendosa St., Physician. **Enid Ng Lim,** 1552 Jackson St., Community Liason. **Russell Matsumoto,** 127 Sweeny St., Attorney. **Inez McClaren,** 1472 Sanchez St., Retired Teacher. **Avery Taylor Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Architect. **Thomas G. Moore,** 220 Presidio Ave., Consultant. **Allen M. Okamoto,** 529 Ortega St., Real Estate/Ins Broker. **Frank R. Passantino,** 411 Marina Blvd., Dentist. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **David Prowler,** 544 Union St., City Planner. **William H. Pryor,** 201 Claremont Blvd., Senior Center Director. **Mervyn F. Silverman,** 119 Frederick St., Physician. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent.

DENNIS JOHN GIANATASSIO

My address is 165 Guerrero Street
My occupation is Public Servant
My qualifications for office are: I am a Christian who practices genuine Gospel values of justice, love, and mercy. San Francisco needs to be renewed in the Spirit of such values. I am a peacemaker. San Francisco is a divided city with wounds which need to be healed. I am a dedicated public servant. We need a Supervisor who knows that true authority is service to others. To love God and serve people is a sacred calling! It is one I have followed throughout my life.

I honestly believe I am well-prepared and capable of serving you, the people of San Francisco, as your newly, elected Supervisor.

Dennis John Gianatassio

The sponsors for Dennis John Gianatassio are:

Richard Alvarez, 538 Somerset St., Sanitation Worker. **Linda Bartholomew,** 15-A Heyman Ave., Waitress. **Carroll Arthur Bjorseth,** 21 Payson St., Hardware Specialist. **Concepcion B. Calija,** 76 Vesta St., Customs Aid. **Virginia Carroll,** 528 Lisbon St., Salesperson. **Victoria Castillo,** 230 Brussels St., Day-Care Coordinator. **Julieta C. DeJesus,** 1909 Silver Ave., Staff Associate. **John M. Gonzales,** 600 Somerset St., Maintenance Machinist. **John Green,** 773 Lisbon St., Retired. **Robert V. Karp,** 530 Brussels St., Deacon. **Michael Mathis,** 3467 19th St., Cab Driver. **Charlton David McKay,** 161 11th Ave., Doorman. **Ramona Michaels,** 331 Bacon St., Secretary. **James Muscat, Jr.,** 70 Girard St., Grocery Clerk Retired. **Barbara Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Proofreader. **Vernon M. Ray,** 207 Olmstead St., Carpenter. **Dolores Robles,** 217 Felton St., Homemaker. **Ernest R. Robles,** 217 Felton St., Steward. **Rev. William H. Ruth,** 522 Shotwell St., Minister. **Darryl Franklin Sanchez,** 225 Duboce Ave., Secretary. **Clarence Cornelius Smith,** 646 Corbett Ave., Cab Driver. **Robert Velarde,** 492 Amherst St., Police Officer. **Teresita C. Vierneza,** 819 Girard St., Store Keeper. **Helen C. Walker,** 940 Fillmore St., Volunteer Worker with the Elderly. **Panchita Rae Wright,** 800 Goettingen St., Homemaker. **Judy J. Xuereb,** 251 Harvard St., Bank Teller.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 114 Broderick Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: San Franciscans need Supervisors willing to fight special-interest power brokers, high-spending bureaucrats and irresponsible developers. As a Supervisor, I have held city government accountable for the honest use of our tax dollars. For example, when developers wanted to spend our taxes on private stadiums and waterfront boondoggles, I was the Supervisor that stood up to them.

Throughout my law enforcement career and as Supervisor, I have acted as a watchdog against waste, wheeling and dealing, and special interest give-aways. As your Supervisor, I will continue to fight to keep city government working hard on your behalf.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Richard D. Hongisto are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Sala Burton**, 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina F. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Lee S. Dolson PhD.**, 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Sam Duca**, 16 Wawona St., Assessor. **Carlton B. Goodlett**, 1360 Turk St., Physician & Newspaper Publisher. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **James R. Herman**, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Ephriam Margolin**, 60 Scenic Wy., Attorney. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director P.H.N.H. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Grant S. Mickins**, 507 Los Palmos Dr., Director Human Rts. Commission. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Ex. Director Japanese Comm. Youth Council. **W.F. O'Keeff, Sr.**, 444 Corbett Ave., Retired. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Rep. **Louise H. Renne**, 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez**, 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Wy., Attorney. **Julie Tang**, 788 18th Ave. **Thomas F. Waddell, M.D.**, 141 Albion St., Physician. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Alfredo M. Rodriquez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator.

ANDREW "DADDY" JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is criminology student, chef, TV Tech.
My age is 59

My qualifications for office are: I am a volunteer at San Francisco General Hospital, Mission Child Care, Mission Community Representative, American Red Cross Volunteer youth counselor.

Known as Chef Andrew the Lobster Tail, King. Known as Daddy Andy the Handyman Citywide. Andrew Jones a Big Famely Man. The third best student in town, CCSF.

Known to all, the Mission Masters, Mission Fathers and businessmen citywide. I'd like to dedicate my supervisoral campaign to 12,000 who voted for me in the past elections.

A special thanks to all of my sponsors.

Truly your candidate,

Andrew "Daddy" Jones

The sponsors for Andrew "Daddy" Jones are:

Brian D. Strnad, 981 Shotwell St., Engineer. **Minnie White**, 1843 Scott St., Chef-Cook. **Rose Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Connie Rucker**, 1146 Key St., Housewife. **Kevin Newman**, 2928 21st St., Video Producer. **E. Perry Winston**, 2866 Harrison St., Architect M.H.D.C. **Helen Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife. **Thomas Owen Mathews**, 204 Hoffman Ave., Retired-Navy. **Joseph A. Macellari**, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Businessman. **Diane Moananu**, 43 Watchman Wy., Student S. F. State. **Timothy Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Repairman. **David L. Butler**, 985 Shotwell St., Shoe Salesman. **Anne Lorina Urbina**, 1024 Shotwell St., Cosmetologist. **Stephen J. Benbow**, 1111 Pine St., Bike Messenger. **Sherry Renee Jones**, 388 Waller St., Unemployed. **Eva Maria Pitolo**, 296 Flournoy St., Medical Asst. **William D. Jackson**, 981 Shotwell St., Musician. **Gary Juliano**, 1955 18th Ave., Sales. **Elaine Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Homemaker/Cook. **Lily Amituanai**, 413 Tehama St., Secretary. **Arturo Vargas**, 1258 South Van Ness Ave., Business Manager. **William H. Abernathy**, 988 Howard St., Postal Employment. **Rudy Perez**, 3254 24th St., Salesmen. **Brenda White**, 125 Rhine St., Switchboard Operator. **Wilfredo A. Garcia**, 1046 Capp St., Self-Employed. **Christine Molard**, 3152 24th St., Sales Manager. **Andrew "Daddy" Jones**, 981 Shotwell St., Cook/TV Tech/Student CCSF. **Dorinda Moreno**, 2670 21st Ave., Writer/Author.

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 825 Post Street
My occupation is Party Of Life
My age is Thirty Years

My qualifications for office are: Because of a false premise soon to be corrected in light of truth self evident, we shall know that life is an all good party. A party is a person, you are the party of life, an organization, a great one, a good time and the best party ever.

I am your Keyes standing at the door. Let me in to supe' with you and you with I, so that we be one. Every man a king, every woman a goddess and babies the best, we need lots more. Let there be just us forever all for all.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 23rd St., Restaurateur. **Wilfred Davila**, 712 Battery St., King. **Naomi Eisenbert**, 901 Bush St., Performer & Violinist. **Robert R. Gartner**, 825 Post St., Artist. **Mickey (Saint) Helmel**, 777-A Tehama St., Musician/Writer. **George R. Jackson**, 1208 Fell St., Businessman. **Stephen Joseph**, 22 Vandewater St., Electrician. **Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes**, 825 Post St., I Am. **Victoria Keyes**, 825 Post St., Goddess. **Ronald E. Lee**, 148 Jones St., Commercial Artist. **Juliet Mauro**, 76 Pasadena St., Security Guard. **John E. Pino**, 443 Broadway St., Carpenter. **William Michael Reynolds**, 1928 Turk St., Artist. **Russ Rudolph**, 1351 47th Ave., Lord. **David C. Schuyler**, 486 Hayes St., Owner-Restaurant. **Marilyn R.Snitman**, 364 Eddy St., Housekeeper. **Cary Tennis**, 524 Columbus St., Writer. **Guy West**, 640 Polk St., Franciscan. **Charles Aden Emerson**, 1024 Montgomery St., Worker. **Lillis Elizabeth Gardner**, 1233 Guerrero St., Bookkeeper. **Dennis C. Lee**, 3210 25th St., Newsvendor. **James Victor Hearn**, 443 Broadway St., Scientist. **David B. Whitlow**, 470 Fulton St., Cook. **William E. Burns**, 1839 Fulton St., Telecommunications. **Roger T. Phelps**, 2451 Greenwich St., Cashier.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

BILL MAHER

My address is 69 Elsie Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Throughout my term, I've focused on improving San Francisco's quality of life, not just for today but also for tomorrow. I'm proud of laws I've written to protect sunlight in parks, preserve our open space and views and remove toxic wastes from our environment. I've sponsored ordinances to protect both small businesses and personal privacy, to preserve existing neighborhoods, increase parking opportunities, accelerate our capital improvement and maintenance programs and create new housing opportunities. During my term we tripled our road repaving and purchased hundreds of new buses. From civil rights to a better Muni, I have worked hard for our city.

Bill Maher

The sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, S.F. Bd. of Education. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **James R. Bronkema,** 405 Davis Ct., Real Estate Developer. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislator/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress, 5th District. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Eugene L. Friend,** 2910 Lake St., Investor. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Thomas E. Horn,** 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Linda Ann Post,** 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Toby Rosenblatt,** 3409 Pacific Ave., Self-employed. **David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission. **Charles Starbuck, III,** 1308 Montgomery St., Attorney. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

NICOLE MYERS

My address is 348 Winfield Street
My occupation is small business owner and neighborhood advocate
My age is 36.
My qualifications for office are: Merchant and proponent of Commercial Rent Arbitration—actively dedicated to saving our neighborhood businesses. Long-time community organizer/volunteer—I know how to get things done. Former community newspaper editor—having direct knowledge of the issues.

I advocate:
—District Elections
—Affordable, quality childcare
—Funding for AIDS research/patients
—Vacancy Control

I oppose:
—Prop 64
—Militarization of the Bay
—City Hall's "Private Club" mentality and its unresponsiveness to the concerns of unions, minorities, the homeless and the average citizen.

As a citizen, small business owner and a humanist, I will represent the real people of San Francisco—not the downtown interests.

Nicole Myers

The sponsors for Nicole Myers are:

Alejandro Alarcon, 1786 Church St., Computer Programmer. **Patricio Ascui,** 348 Winfield St., Business Owner. **Sultan A. Bhimjee,** 199 Powhattan St., Professor. **Claudia W. Brisson,** 1242 Sanchez St., Lawyer. **Thomas E. Dixon, Jr.,** 486 Castro St., Entertainer. **Mark Farrell,** 311-A San Jose Ave., Taxi Cab Driver. **Stanley R. Fisher,** 991 Dolores St., Comedy Agent/Club Owner. **Lurilla Harris,** 196 Putnam St., Printer. **Herbert Hernandez,** 1261 Florida St., Comm. Organizer & Tenant Counselor. **Roberto Hernandez,** 852 Moultrie St., Executive Producer. **Marta Johnson,** 199 Bonview St., Registered Nurse/Health Educator. **Hope N. Jolles,** 1786 Church St., Social Activist. **Kay L. Kohout,** 1446 17th Ave., Admin. Assist. **Julie Nix,** 678 Haight St., Business Manager. **Maria V. Pinedo,** 425 Brazil Ave., Director Studio 24. **J. Annette Podesta,** 131-A Cortland Ave., Sheet Metal Worker, Local 104. **Jonathan Rapp, M.D.,** 471-1/2 29th St., Physician. **James R. Rhoades,** 81 Downey St., Consultant. **Karen Rohn-Edwards,** 14 Juri St., Artist Representative. **Eric A. Spiererman,** 142 Amber Dr., Teacher/Counselor. **John Warnes,** 712 10th Ave., Lawyer.

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent, Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: During two terms as Supervisor, I have fought for lower taxes; better, more affordable Muni services; jobs; senior services; rent control; programs—funded by the Mayor and the Board—to prevent contamination of our drinking water from waste or toxics. I recently negotiated an exemption for residents from utility taxes beginning January 1987.

My personal efforts obtained a police fingerprint computer, already identifying more than 1800 dangerous criminals.

My workplace smoking law orders fairness to smokers but requires clean air for nonsmokers.

As Supervisor, lawyer, and mother of two public school children, I will continue to fight for you.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Police Officer. **Robert K. Werbe,** 899 Pine St. Executive., **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Stan Smith,** 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official. **Nick Geracimos,** 180 St. Elmo Wy., Auto Salesman. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba St., Educator. **Melvin M. Swig,** 201 Locust St., Real Estate/Hotel Management. **James A. Scatena,** 101 St. Elmo Wy., Vice Pres. Nat'l Italian American. **John Moylan,** 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader. **John Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Newspaperman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President Community College Board. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Director. **Leonard (Lefty) Gordon,** 140 Margaret Ave., Director. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **Haig G. Mardikian,** 245 Locust St., Businessman. **Joseph P. Sharpe,** 1547 46th Ave., Labor Official. **Beatrice Duncan,** 737 Haight St., Anti-Crime Specialist. **Alessandro Baccari,** 430 West Portal Ave., Marketing. **Madeline Samarzes,** 264 Dalewood Wy., Union Representative. **Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.,** 433 Bartlett St., Pres. Police Comm. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker. **Mary F. Patterson,** 6423 Geary Blv., Executive. **Florence Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Restaurant Owner. **Samuel W. Walker,** 562 Campbell Ave., Labor Leader. **Aldo J. Rossetto,** 781 Panorama Dr., Firefighter. **Thomas F. McDonough,** 1562 38th Ave., Retired. **Louis G. Spadia,** 1177 California St., Executive. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Mary O. Ganotise,** 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Program Administrator
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of committed service to neglected communities. I make San Francisco work for everyone.

—I've developed innovative human services programs for every minority.

—I helped create our nationally acclaimed AIDS care and prevention program.

—I've advocated equality for women, including pay equity and protection from abuse.

As your Supervisor, I will act to establish:

—Job training for residents to meet our city's needs. These include child care directors and paramedics.

—Protection of renters from unfair evictions through vacancy control and strict penalties on illegal conversions.

—Planning that serves residents. Neighborhood character must be protected; our streets must be accessible.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, School Board. **Jerry Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Jim Gonzalez**, 642 Edinburgh St., Mayor's Special Assistant. **Richard K. Grosboll**, 257 16th Ave., Attorney. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Pres. War Memorial Board. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Kenneth W. Jones**, 33 Prospect Ave., Director Volunteer Services S.F. AID. **Gayle Justice**, 36 Blair Ter., S.F. Program Director. **Tony Kilroy**, 473 11th Ave., Neighborhood Environmentalist. **Michael Lighty**, 55 Octavia St., Business Agent Mabet Local 15. **David Looman**, 1710 30th Ave., Political Consultant. **Hon Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Hon Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author. **Carole Migden**, 561 28th St., Community Health Director. **Jane McKaskle Murphy**, 2255 Washington St., Retired. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator Police Commission. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Sal Rosselli**, 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Rikki Streicher**, 20 Belgrave Ave., Businesswoman. **Dr. Tom Waddell**, 140 Albion Wy., M.D. **Chantale Y. M. Wong**, 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer.

A.D. (WYATT) NORTON

My address is 676-47th Avenue
My occupation is Artist
My age is 28
My qualifications for office are: The law allows no racial slurs, so I can only describe myself as quite the American Melting Pot. As an alleged direct descendant of Blackie Norton and Emperor Norton I, I have this twisted City's best interests at heart. LaRouche fanatics in the City should be quarantined and tatooed. Our City needs to finally have a nosebreather on the Board. City Government should deal with City problems, as they were elected to do. If elected I will buy a new suit. I am for the ritual and total destruction of the Vaillancourt Fountain. In short, I am always fun to watch.

A. D. Norton

The sponsors for A. D. (Wyatt) Norton are:

Michael Beckmann, 529 Buchanan St., Chef. **Susan Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Marketing Analyst. **Thomas R. Bernard,** 1920 Golden Gate Ave., Chem. Engr. **Robert C. Briscoe,** 3232 Balboa St., Printer. **Evelyn F. Brurnn,** 440 Molimo Dr., Manufacturers Rep. **Frank Castelan,** 666 47th Ave., Retired. **Lary Collins,** 117 Lyon St., Teacher. **Steven J. Colvin,** 4131 19th St., Word Processor. **Dorothea Jean Cox,** 3133 Washington St., Consultant. **Claude Durall,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Designer. **Sarah J. Hiebert Flowers,** 3877 17th St., Author. **Martin Ganapoler,** 1201 8th Ave., Picture Framer. **Dan Grace,** 225 9th St., Bartender. **Kenneth E. Gwin, Jr.,** 2833 25th St., Artist. **Martha Hammerstein,** 2209 Day St., Sales. **Josh G. Koral,** 239 28th St, Designer. **Joe Locke,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Victor R. Lopez,** 670 47th Ave., Nurse. **Teri MacDonald,** 829 Cortland Ave., Photographer. **Kena Milberg,** 150 Anderson St., Mother. **Patricia R. O'Neil,** 676 47th Ave., Artist. **H.C. Overbaugh,** 101 Sutro Hts., Retired Apt. House Owner. **Joseph Elliott Spires,** 1384 Masonic Ave., Stockman. **Renee Walker,** 3726 16th St., Receptionist. **Elske Zoetmulder,** 3949 21st St., Bookkeeper.

JANET SHIRLEY

My address is 573 Alvarado Street
My occupation is Businesswoman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan. Businesswoman. Key organizer to put Commercial Rent Arbitration on the ballot. Member, Mayor's Task Force on Commercial Leasing. Founder, San Francisco Food Project, which collected and distributed 20 tons of food to homeless and AIDS victims. Community Activist. Humanist.

Small businesses are being driven out of San Francisco. They need protection. The homeless need shelter and low income people need affordable housing. It's time for Supervisors to respond to the needs of people who voted them into office. This is my priority. I am committed to people's representation in city government. Let's put a new voice in City Hall.

Janet Shirley

The sponsors for Janet Shirley are:

Gabrielle Bardales, 1895 16th Ave., Bilingual Instructor. **Javier A. Bardales,** 1895 16th Ave., Housing Outreach & Case Worker. **Giuliana Black,** 320 San Jose Ave., Interpreter. **Louise Brugnone,** 1773 Mason St., Business Owner. **Jean E. Burke,** 700 Ashbury St., Sales Assistant. **Donald Currie,** 4006 25th St., Student. **K. C. Enderes,** 3550 California St., Psychiatric Technician. **Robin Enderes,** 3550 California St., Bank Teller. **Teresa D. Fennelly,** 443 Dolores St., Research Assistant. **Beth Garvey,** 991 Dolores St., Asian Refugee Counselor. **Herman Hobi,** 2590 26th Ave., Business Owner. **Nora Ann Howard,** 6038 California St., Peace Activist. **Rebecca Kondos,** 1750 Anza St., Marketing Manager. **Simon C. Leo,** 1424 California St., Taxi Driver. **Laura Mankikar,** 1245 16th Ave., Computer Consultant. **Barbara Matison,** 747 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Jack G. Pekarek,** 2841 Sacramento St., Noe Valley Merchant. **Linda Ramey,** 65 Gates St., Merchant. **George M. Raya,** 2028 Pierce St., Project Coordinator. **Trudi Richards,** 88 Tiffany Ave., Graphic Artist. **Margaret Rivera,** 1306 Valencia St., Flight Attendant. **David E. Roberts,** 799 Ashbury St., Photographer. **Carol J. Sanderson,** 3337-B 17th St., Teacher. **James A. Schmitt,** 251 9th St., Treasurer, Recycling Center. **Roger Smart,** 1977 McAllister St., Clerk. **Richard A. Wall,** 574 3rd St., Bike Messenger.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for Supervisor

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Avenue
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney/ Board Member of S.F. Community College District
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Twice elected to the San Francisco Community College District Governing Board with the highest number of votes in 1980 and 1984, I have demonstrated the ability to provide quality education for San Francisco residents.

As a Supervisor, I will promote job opportunities, enhance economic benefits and enrich the quality of life for San Franciscans. San Francisco should be a safe place for families, the elderly and single individuals. I believe I can represent the diversity of San Francisco's population and the future of San Francisco.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy., Pastor, Vice Chairman Comm. College Board. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Golden Gate Business & Civic Women Organization. **Douglas S. Chan,** 140 Valparaiso St., Attorney. **Michael A. Chan,** 1650 Funston Ave., Planner. **Gordon Chin,** 60 Castro St., Executive Director, Chinatown Resource Center. **Greg Day,** 2268 Market St., Youth Services Director. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Wayne Friday,** 1095 14th St., Journalist. **Frank S. Fling,** 621 Greenwich St., Architect. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Carl Michael Housh,** 79 Walter St., Administrator Assistant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/ Commissioner. **Gordon Juan, M.D.,** 1838 11th Ave., Physician. **Gilman Grant Louie,** 147 22nd Ave., Computer Corporation President. **Rick Pacurar,** 79 Walter St., Arts Administrator. **Roland Quan,** 407 35th Ave., CPA. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Asst. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Arnold G. Townsend,** 1440 Golden Gate Ave., Consultant. **Kathleen Owyang Turner,** 88 Peralta Ave., Community Activist. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U. C. Regent. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., University Professor. **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Wy., Member, Board of Education. **Chantale Y.M. Wong,** 2174 Bush St., Sanitary Engineer. **Samson W. Wong,** 1851 11th Ave., Student. **Harold T. Yee,** 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Henry Yep,** 1510 24th Ave., Accountant.

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 355 Green Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: In my six years as a Supervisor, I've enacted innovative solutions to improve the quality of life in San Francisco. I've worked effectively to make our city a safe, healthy, prosperous and affordable place for working families and single people, for young and old. I've helped improve our public health care system, create pay equity for city workers, encourage childcare, save small businesses, preserve our neighborhoods, protect the environment and develop jobs. As Finance Committee Chair, I've helped keep our city fiscally sound. With your support, I'll continue to work for a bright future for San Francisco.

Nancy G. Walker

The sponsors for Nancy G. Walker are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assembly. **Robert F. Barry,** 3454 Pierce St., Police Officer Association. **Miriam Blaustein,** 4095 Amry St., Advocate for Seniors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Member of Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Member, Bd of Education. **Angela Coppola,** 2018 Bush St., Business Executive. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Wy., Educator. **Lee S. Dolson,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd,** 555 Noriega St., Minister. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **James R. Herman,** 635 Connecticut St., President ILWU. **Vivian Hallinan,** 1080 Chestnut St., Retired. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Bruce W. Lilienthal,** 740 Kirkham St., Chair Small Business Commission. **Leo T. McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Agency Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Edward W. Moose,** 1962 Powell St., Restaurateur. **Gina Moscone,** 45 St. Francis Blv., Homemaker. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Bob Ross,** 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Richard Sanchez,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Thelma Shelley,** 70 Everson St., Managing Director, War Memorial. **Stephen Taber,** 1915 Oak St., President Coalition for S.F. Neighborhood. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., S.F. Community College Board. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent University of California.

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, our people and our neighborhoods. I have dedicated my work to improve City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Of extreme importance is protection of small businesses in San Francisco, especially those owned by San Franciscans, women and minorities. Also, I am working to assure an environment which will provide a clean, healthy atmosphere for ourselves and our children.

Three times elected to the Board of Supervisors, two terms on the Community College Board, I have always been "Open to the Public"....

Doris M. Ward

The sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presido Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blv., Representative in Congress. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly. **Art Agnos,** 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Wy, Pastor, VP Community College Board. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, S.F. Community College. **Henry E. Berman,** 483 Euclid St., Consultant. **Morris Bernstein,** 1740 Broadway St., Investor. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **John L. Burton,** 766 Kansas St., Lawyer. **H. Welton Flynn,** 76 Venus St., Public Accountant. **Mike Hardeman,** 329 Wawona St., Union Official. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Agar Jaicks,** 62 Woodland Ave., TV Director. **Rev. Calvin Jones,** 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor. **Gordan J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Robert J. McCarthy,** 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., Health Administrator. **Sandra A. Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Administrator. **Juanita Owens,** 371-A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Sal Rosseli,** 45 Bache St., Union Representative. **Thomatra N. Scott,** 1912-½ Broderick St., Program Monitor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is columnist for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 60
My qualifications for office are: My socialist program:

Labor, not corporations, should run San Francisco. Workers need a labor party to win decent standards and defend rights of women, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians.

Human needs before profits! We need jobs, schools, childcare centers, health care —not nuclear ships in the Bay or troops in Central America.

Rents cut to no more than 10% of renters' income.

Money to fight AIDS, not war. No on 64.

Defend workers' rights against employers. No two-tier pay or two-gate jobs. Keep cops and courts out of strikes. Labor solidarity against concessions.

Stop attacks against abortion clinics. No forced drug testing.

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Amanda Chapman, 466 14th St., Student. **Nancy G. Elnor,** 615 Central Ave., University Faculty Member. **Susan L. Englander,** 3456 17th St., Registered Nurse. **Carl Finamore,** 477 Hickory St., Oil Refinery Operator. **Alexandra Folger,** 298 Fair Oaks St., Law Office Assistant. **Patricia M. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Secretary. **Suzanne L. Forsyth,** 77 Cedro Ave., Student. **May May Gong,** 477 Hickory St., Power Plant Operator. **Millie B. Gonzalez,** 190 College Ave., Tutor. **Asher F. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired ILWU Life Member. **Ruth L. Harer,** 149 Detroit St., Retired. **Donald Gary Harmon,** 1297 18th St., Retail Clerk. **Victoria Lindsay,** 3795 24th St., Professor. **Eiko P. Mizuhara,** 205 21st Ave., Sales. **Esther W. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Hayden H. Perry,** 3783 20th St., Retired. **Joseph Michael Ryan,** 1020 Potrero Ave., Machinist. **Ruth E. Schein,** One Baker St., Editor. **Michael William Schreiber,** 3593 Mission St., Municipal Bus Driver. **Carole Seligman,** 245 Whitney St., Muni Driver. **Kathryn Setian,** 1364 16th Ave., Engineer. **Lisa Slifer,** 651 Upland Dr., Student. **Christine Vaughn,** 1255 Polk St., Clerk. **David Walters,** 190 College Ave., Auxilliary Operator. **Brian Webster,** 795 8th Ave., Sales Representative. **Nancy F. Wohlforth,** 737 Burnett Ave., Union Representative. **Adam Wood,** 190 Parnassus Ave., Musician.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar's Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, **it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.**

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore **housewives** and **retired people,** as well as others who are interested in **community service** are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who **apply in person.** Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name_____

Address_____ Apt. #_____

Telephone No. (required)_____

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): _____

Second choice locations (if any)_____

Signature_____

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for College Board

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 8 Sloat Boulevard
My occupation is Educator/Member, S.F. Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have been a member of the Community College Board since its inception in 1972. As an Adult Education teacher for over 20 years, I have learned the value of open-door continuing education. I have always stressed outreach in education to all segments of our community. We have over 80 sites for education under Chinatown, Downtown, Mission, Valencia-Castro Centers and City College. I have consistently advocated affirmative action within the district. We have grown both at City College and in the Centers without losing the district's fiscal integrity, even under the impact of Prop 13.

Robert E. Burton

The sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Ernest C. Ayala,** 4402 20th St., President S.F. CCB. **Susan J. Bierman,** 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender of San Francisco. **Willie L. Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Member of Assembly, Attorney. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Shirley Cohelan Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College. **Charlotte C. Danforth,** 69 Turquoise Way, Labor Attorney. **Gerald J. DeRyan,** 3433 Rivera St., Education, Teacher Advocate. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., College Professor. **Adria Garabedian,** 191 Delmar St., Community Activist. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Richard D. Hongisto,** 114 Broderick St., Supervisor CCSF. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., City & County Supervisor. **Gordon J. Lau,** 540 19th Ave., Attorney. **Lim P. Lee,** 1036 Pacific Ave., Retire Postmaster. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Carole Migden,** 561 28th St., County Central Committee Chair. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Kevin J. Ryan,** 438 Masonic Ave., Union Representative. **Carol Ruth Silver,** 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, CCSF. **Julie Tang,** 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Member, SF Board of Supervisors. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Alan S. Wong,** 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker.

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 252 Broad Street
My occupation is incumbent, Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: I have served on the Community College Board since 1972.

During that period I have found it to grow to the superior educational system it is—City College and the Centers Division—serving some 58,000 students.

I have always worked for merit appointments and oppposed much of the politicization going on at the College today. I have tried to see we spend most of our money where needed—on teachers for our students and not on expensive buildings.

John Riordan

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

John Barbacelate, 155 Lorenzo Wy., S.F. Supervisor, Ret. **Louis F. Batmale,** 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Former Chancellor, S.F. Community College Dist. **Thomas J. Cahill,** 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police, Ret. **George Christopher,** 1170 Sacramento St., S.F. Mayor, Ret. **Robert Devries,** 351-B 29th St., Lawyer. **Harold S. Dobbs,** 1000 Mason St., Attorney. **Patrick J. Dowling,** 173 Cerritos Ave., Librarian Irish Cultural Center. **John T. C. Fang,** 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, Asian Week Journalist. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor. **Msgr James B. Flynn,** 2535 40th Ave., Pastor, St. Gabriels Church. **Dean Goodman,** 825 Geary St., Actor-Retired Teacher. **Thomas F. Hayes,** 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor. **Quentin L. Kopp,** 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney-At-Law, Supervisor. **Eileen Kivlehan,** 1494 7th Ave., Irish Literary/Historical Soc. **John Loschiavo, S. J.,** 2130 Fulton St., Pres. University of San Francisco. **Ephraim Margolin,** 60 Scenic Wy., Lawyer. **Me Me Riordan,** 1426 Willard St., English Dept. City College. **James J. Rudden,** 1170 Sacramento St., V.P., S.F. Port Commission. **James F. Sing,** 3005 Jackson St., Physician. **Michael C. Tobriner,** 472 Jersey St., Attorney. **Burl A. Toler,** 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Administrator. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California. **John J. (Jack) Webb,** 100 Moncada Wy., Owner, Ireland 32, Ret. Insp. SFPD Former Charter Commissioner. **John Whooley,** 1717 14th Ave., Editor, Irish Herald.

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My address is 3090 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Educator, State and County Central Committeeman, Transportation Engineering Consultant
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Comments elected County Central Committeeman Silvestri, past visiting San Francisco State University instructor:

"Re-elect Governor George Deukmejian."

"City College needs innovative educational programs, annual musical festivals, improved adult education classes and better foreign language instruction."

"Discredited BART director Eugene Garfinkle has done nothing to end City College traffic congestion with Balboa Park BART Station's unbuilt parking facilities. Instead, Garfinkle voted to elect John Birch Society activist Robert Allen 1983 BART President. Garfinkle was denounced on KRON-TV for false 1982 endorsements. Garfinkle joined with racist Lester O'Shea in signing 1984 right-wing extremist mailouts against Supervisor Molinari."

Robert Silvestri

The sponsors for Robert Silvestri are:

Clara Armanini, 3085 23rd Ave., Housewife. **John Armanini,** 3085 23rd Ave., Retired. **John Badagliacco,** 2919 23rd Ave., Real Estate Broker. **Donna M. Benedetti,** 1683 38th Ave., Banking. **Stanley F. Bramwell,** 4010 San Bruno Ave., County Committeeman. **Amos Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Carpenter. **Josephine Cendali,** 19 Inverness Dr., Secretary. **George Delew,** 3025 23rd Ave., Attorney. **Terence Faulkner,** 2371 42nd Ave., County Committeeman. **Charles V. Gaetani,** 176 Marview Wy., Realtor. **Tony E. Gaetani,** 65 Mountain Spring Ave., Retired Highway Patrolman. **Joseph Gotelli,** 1 Gladeview Wy., Contractor. **Jeane Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave., Housewife. **William D. Handelsman,** 3110 Ocean Ave.., Semi Retired Labor. **Regina M. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Secretary S.F. Hlth Dept. **William A. Irwin,** 1416 44th Ave., Recreation & Park. **Cedric S. Leach,** 3080 23rd Ave., Painter. **Morris Plansky,** 3010 23rd Ave., Contractor. **Anne Rinaldi,** 2433 Turk St., State Central Committeewoman. **Josephine Silvestri,** 3090 23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman. **Helen Smith,** 66 San Fernando Wy., Teacher. **Shirley B. Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., State Central Committeewoman. **Tom Spinosa,** 9 Talbert St., Bart Board Candidate. **Joseph E. Tinney,** 1 Melba Ave., Attorney. **Alexander D. Vucetich,** 3005 23rd Ave., Retired Pilot.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: In my 10 years on the school board, I have:

1) insisted on administrative accountability through long-range planning and formal evaluation.

2) helped thousands of families cut through the bureaucracy to get services they are entitled to; and

3) earned a reputation for integrity, independence and professionalism.

I have been Board President twice, chaired committees on curriculum, budget, and building and grounds, and serve on the Council of Great City Schools.

I am Executive Director of Mission Language and Vocational School's employer-supported training programs which yearly place over 300 youth and adults in the competitive job market.

Rosario Anaya

The sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Ernest "Chuck" Ayala**, 4402 20th St., President SF Community College Board. **Richard L. Bains**, 333 Precita Ave., Musician. **Susan J. Bierman**, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner. **Harry G. Britt**, 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Babette Drefke**, 701 Kansas St., Self Employed. **Luisa E. Ezquerro**, 212 Fair Oaks St., Teacher. **Dianne Feinstein**, 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor, San Francisco. **Lawrence Ferlinghetti**, 250 Francisco St., Poet, Bookstore Proprietor. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 555 Noriega St., Pastor. **Robert E. Gonzales**, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Joe Jung**, 1769 Hyde St., Self Employed. **Quentin L. Kopp**, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor. **John LoSchiavo, S.J.**, 2130 Fulton St., President—U.S.F. **Phyllis Lyon**, 651 Duncan St., Educator. **Bill Maher**, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Leo T. McCarthy**, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor of California. **Peter Mezey**, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer. **John L. Molinari**, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Joan Zamora Moulton**, 844 Florida St., Human Rights Commissioner. **Wendy Nelder**, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Pat Norman**, 319 Richland Ave., Administrator. **Alfredo M. Rodriguez**, 3541 21st St., Administrator. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Joan-Marie Shelley**, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher and Union President. **Nancy G. Walker**, 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso St., Education Specialist. **Doris M. Ward**, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor.

JULE C. ANDERSON
(formerly Jule C. Johnson)

My address is 575 Ninth Avenue
My occupation is Educator
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have served the community for two decades as a person committed to the improved delivery of educational services to our children. I have worked with school volunteers, served as PTA and PTSA president, School Board Member, NAACP president, Delinquency Prevention Commission, and as Education Specialist at Ella Hill Hutch Community Center.

Vote for a candidate with a proven record of concern for education, not politics, cooperation not confrontation, improving academic standards and developing parent and community participation.

I want to work with Superintendent Cortines and the School Board to increase student success, decrease drop-outs and improve curriculum.

Jule C. Anderson

The sponsors for Jule C. Anderson are:

Thomas Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher. **Willie R. Brown**, 828 Buchanan St., Retired. **Vera Lee Clanton**, 1 Anza Vista Ave., Church Woman. **Anne Belisle Daley**, 795 Geary St., Executive Director. **Ina P. Dearman**, 217 Upper Ter., Home Executive. **Libby Denebeim**, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member. **Robert DeVries**, 351 B 29th St., Attorney. **Edgar Flowers, Jr.**, 11 Stanford Heights Ave., Assistant Sheriff. **Lotus Yee Fong**, 85 Western Shore Lane, Parent Volunteer. **Dr. Howard S. Gloyd**, 55 Noriega St., Pastor. **Zuretti L.Goosby**, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist. **Leonard Gordon**, 140 Margaret Ave., Executive Director. **Jean Y. Hibino**, 732 26th Ave., Secretary. **Jack Jacqua**, 236 San Jose Ave., Counseling Aide. **Geraldine M. Johnson**, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer. **Margel Kaufman**, 3036 20th Ave., Realtor. **Dr. Julianne Malveaux**, 3247-B Harrison St., Economist/Writer. **Del Martin**, 651 Duncan St., Author-lecturer. **Enola D. Maxwell**, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Laurie McBride**, 925 Cole St., Self-Employed. **Wayne Moore**, 473 Corbett Ave., Painter Contractor. **Randall A. Padgett**, 317 Chenery St., Attorney. **Karen Goodson Pierce**, 1734 Newcomb Ave., Attorney at Law. **Linda Ann Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Gene Royale**, 1440 Florida St., University Administrator. **Carol Ruth Silver**, 68 Ramona Ave., Attorney. **Percy Smith, Jr.**, 1735 7th Ave., Minister. **Mabel Teng**, 942 Broadway St., Educator. **Calvin Welch**, 519 Ashbury St., Community Organizer. **Hank Wilson**, 1651 Market St., Hotel Manager.

GREG DAY

My address is 2268 Market Street
My occupation is Youth Services Director
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: I have experience as a classroom teacher and university instructor. As a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Homeless Youth I helped found Larkin Street Youth Center where I work as Community Relations Director. I am Co-Chair of the Campaign to Re-Open San Francisco's Playgrounds After School. I am a member of the Mayor's Advisory Council on Children, Youth and Families and Chair of the Citizen's Committee on Community Development where I review funding for children and family services. As a member of the Family Life and Health Education Committee of the School District I worked to improve curriculum.

Greg Day

The sponsors for Greg Day are:

John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Richard D. Hongisto**, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor, CCSF. **Arlo Smith**, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Jeff Brown**, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Michael Hennessey**, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco. **Harold T. Yee**, 1280 Ellis St., Economist. **Doris Woodhouse Kahn**, 3259 Clay, Transportation Commissioner. **Yori Wada**, 565 4th Ave., Regent. **Jean Jacobs**, 95 San Andreas Way, Advocate for children. **John Francis Rothmann**, 629 Arguello Blvd., Consultant. **Alicia Wang**, 140 Valparaiso, Educational Specialist. **Jerry E. Berg**, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney. **Rev. Jean M. Richardson**, 323 Chattanooga St., Presbyterian Minister. **Jeff Mori**, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Juanita Owens**, 371-A Coleridge St., Educator. **Janet Shalwitz**, 100 Kensington Way, Physician. **Edward DeLaCruz**, 1729 Lake St., Social Worker. **Catherine J. Dodd**, 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Thomas E. Horn**, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney. **Bob Ross**, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher. **Roderick A. McLeod**, 421 Yerba Buena Ave., Attorney. **James M. Foster**, 1830 Eddy St., Health Consultant. **Linda Post**, 1846 15th St., Marketing Representative. **Donald Disler**, 120 Alpine Ter., Attorney. **Michael Basten**, 1658 12th Ave., Juvenile Probation Officer. **Roberto Esteves**, 34 Caselli Ave., Librarian.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Teacher/Engineer
My qualifications for office are: 21 Years of Teaching Experience: City College of San Francicso, Engineering Dept.; Mission High School; Giannini Middle School; Ulloa Elementary School, tutoring 1st graders.

Plus: 25 Years of Engineering & Management experience in Industry.

Too many children are failing in school, so—Back to Basics: "Reading, Writing, Arithmetic"

William Felzer

The sponsors for William Felzer are:

Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Chancellor/Superintendent, Community College District, (Retired). **Harry W. Frustuck,** 147 Melrose St., Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Warren R. White,** 15 Allston Way, Past President of City College of San Francisco. **Ralph O. Hillsman,** 22 Huntington Dr., Vice President of City College of San Francisco, (Retired). **John J. Brady,** 1441 38th Ave., Retired CCSF Administrative Dean. **J. H. Conley,** 569 Hill St., CCSF Physics Dept. Head. **Peter C. Gardner,** 683 Miramar Ave., CCSF Criminology Dept. Head. **Madeline Mueller,** 1163 Naples St., CCSF Music Dept. Head. **Grover Klemmer,** 360 Castenada Ave., Retired CCSF P.E. Dept. Head. **Lawrence B. Wong,** 64 Sycamore St., Retired CCSF H&R Dept. Head. **Edward Dierauf,** 553 15th Ave., CCSF Engineering Instructor. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.** 1501 Beach St., CCSF History Instructor. **JoAnn Hendricks,** 2300 31st Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Julius J. Jelinek,** 1080 Alabama, Retired CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Betty J. Johnson,** 4301 Ocean Ave., CCSF Business Instructor. **Veronica Hunnicutt,** 55 Minerva St., CCSF English Instructor. **N V. Deggendorfer,** 160 San Pablo Ave., Ret. CCSF Engn. Instructor. **Stephen R. Levinson,** 15 7th Ave., CCSF English Instructor. **C.F. Maloney,** 326 Santa Ana Ave., CCSF Counseling Instructor. **Manfred E. Mueller,** 1045 Cole St., Ret. CCSF Chemistry Instructor. **Paul S. Hungerford,** 1511 35th Ave., Ret. High School Admin. **E. Patricia Lucey,** 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney. **Frank J. Surina,** 1841 37th Ave., Retired SFPD Police Lt. **John Stattery,** 2845 Santiago St., Retired SFFD Fireman. **Ike Felzer,** 2107 14th Ave., Retired General Contractor. **A. John Shimmon,** 19 Middlefield Dr., Former Deputy to Board of Equalization Member. **Arthur J. Goedewaagen,** 2283 37th Ave., President S&P Education Executive Action Committee. **Mae V. Spohn,** 550 Battery St., Volunteer for Aged Commission. **Joseph Leone,** 52 Exeter St., Past President, Postal Workers Union Local 2, AFL-CIO. **Cecilia B. Hochhawser,** 45 Berkeley Way, Service Off. NARFE Ch. 65.

MYRA G. KOPF

My address is 1940 12th Avenue
My occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: As an educator, parent of three public school educated children, PTA leader, and school board member, I have a proven record of leadership, integrity, caring, and effectiveness.

My collegues elected me President of the National Council of Great City Schools, President of the Association of California Urban School Districts, and twice President of the San Francisco School Board.

Throughout the changes of policies in the education and administration of our school district, I have kept constant a vision of a school system where each child has fair and equal opportunity for honest and effective education.

I promise to continue.

Myra G. Kopf

The sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 643 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman. **Jene Rita Alviar,** 2537 Bryant St., Community Activist. **Jeff Brown,** 850 40th Ave., Public Defender. **Dorothy M. Casper,** 475 Chestnut St., Property Management. **Catherine J. Dood,** 1382 26th Ave., Registered Nurse. **Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.,** 1501 Beach St., Professor. **Carlota Texidor del Portillo,** 84 Berkeley Way, Educator/Civil Service Commission. **Libby Denebeim,** 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education. **Susan Eisenberg,** 131 14th Ave., Health Administrator. **James M. Foster,** 1830 Eddy St., Health Commissioner. **Michael Hennessey,** 261 Anderson St., Sheriff. **Barbara Holman,** 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA & Community Activist. **Antonio E. Juanillo,** 5 Montecito Ave., President Filip-American Council. **James W. Kearney,** 160 Meadowbrook Drive, Educator. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **Frances M. McAteer,** 130 Santa Ann Ave., Recreation and Park Commissioner. **Leo McCarthy,** 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor. **Jacqueline Nemerovski,** 40 Seaview Ter., Arts Commissioner. **Juanita Owens,** 371 A Coleridge St., Educator, Police Commissioner. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **James A. Rivaldo,** 430 Steiner St., Public Affairs Consultant. **Fred A. Rodriguez,** 523 Oak Park Drive, Recreation & Park Commissioner. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Will Tsukamoto,** 96 Amethyst Way, Real Estate Broker. **Martin S. Weiner,** 2266 California St., Rabbi. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Malcolm S.M. Watts,** 270 Sea Cliff Ave., Physician. **Michael Wong,** 590 2nd Ave., Operations Analyst.

GILMAN LOUIE

My address is 147 22nd Avenue
My occupation is Computer Corporation President
My age is 26
My qualifications for office are: A native of San Francisco, I graduated from our City's public schools and received an honors degree from San Francisco State University. I am president of a computer software company and employ 18 people. I am a member of the Family Life and Health Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee of the San Francisco School District. I chair the Computer Curriculum Advisory Committee of Downtown Community College; and volunteer as a teachers aide bringing computer skills to the classroom. My priorities are: teaching English skills, improving math and science skills, setting performance goals for students and teachers and rewarding teachers for educational excellence.

Gilman Louie

The sponsors for Gilman Louie are:

Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College. **John YeHall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., Banker. **R. Hunter Morey,** 515 John Muir Dr., Social Worker/Sex Educator. **Melvin L. Washington,** 1 St. Francis Pl., Sales. **Juan R. Martinez,** 2864 Bryant St., Operations Manager. **Ralph Kugler,** 742 19th Ave., Police Officer. **Deepinder Sekhon,** 380 16th Ave., Banker. **Bok F. Pon,** 435 14th Ave., Businessman. **Michael A. Kelly,** 145 22nd Ave., Attorney. **Shirley Shigeko Murakami,** 833 44th Ave., Secretary. **Lawrence G. Barbu,** 2409 Scott St., Consultant. **Kristen R. Coston,** 2444 Great Highway, Student. **Kay Keiko Onishi,** 112 Ortega St., Graphic Artist. **Angela Chu,** 525 Judah St., Social Worker. **Phuong Vynh Le,** 4009 Noriega St., Student at SFSU. **Kenneth R. Hanson,** 435 Warren Dr., Grocer. **George M. Eastes,** 1818 Page St., Printer. **Faustino C. Saoit,** 401 Italy St., Broiler Plant Mechanic. **Louis Hop Lee,** 788 18th Ave., Lawyer. **Angela G. Rando,** 139 23rd Ave., Self-employed/Delicatessen owner. **Michael D. Denton,** 127 Steiner St., Salesman. **Ricky Wong,** 1651 30th Ave., Insurance Agent. **Dorothy M. Campbell,** 360 Crestlake Dr., Retired. **Joseph S. Quan,** 574 18th Ave., Retired. **Susan D. Lee,** 2575 15th Ave., Systems Engineer. **Sammy A. Castillo,** 144 Clipper St., Pharmacist. **Wilbur Woo,** 34 Marvel Court, Educator. **George Okamoto,** 151 22nd Ave., Merchant. **Richard Sanchez M.D.,** 3450 21st St., Pediatrician. **Albert Sum,** 1750 33rd Ave., Meat Cutter.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Candidates for School Board

MICHAEL MOBERG

My address is 222 Molimo Drive
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a parent, former teacher, homeowner, MBA, and a California CPA.

I believe the purpose of education is to nurture the reasoning ability of each student, by emphasizing the development of civilization through science, technology, literature, music, languages, and history, thereby stimulating to the greatest extent the student's spirit of creativity, so every student can make the maximium contribution to our nation, culture, and future civilization.

Both creative contribution and reasoning ability can be destroyed by drug abuse in school and in society.

I will support policies which combat drug slavery and promote students' ability to reason.

Michael Moberg

The sponsors for Michael Moberg are:

Donna J. Leimbach, 290 Bella Vista Way, Teacher-homemaker. **Velma Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Homemaker. **Frederick W. Walters,** 3061-A Pine St., Electronic Tech. **Loretta Hite,** 362 Los Palmos Dr., Retired City Employee. **Dorothy V. Ryan,** 589 Congo St., Retired Accountant. **Louis Green,** 26 Bridgeview Drive, Housewife. **Dorothy J. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Teacher. **Arthur Richard Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Attorney at Law. **Kenneth L. Leimbach,** 290 Bella Vista Way, Retired Dentist. **Richard Riley,** 150 Marietta Dr., Travel Agent. **Dorothy Tischer,** 562 Flood Ave., Retired/Housewife. **Raul Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retire-Bank employee. **Harold A. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Store owner. **Ruth Greenwood,** 39 Bella Vista Way, Medical Transcriber. **Jeanette Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Clerk. **Richard W. Shuttleworth,** 222 Molimo Dr., Salesman. **Theresa R. Cantor,** 808 Detroit St., Retired - Advertising Business. **Fred R. Briscoe,** 666 Hearst Ave., Retired Driver RR Express. **Harriet Montalvo,** 35 Gaviota Way, Retired - Homemaker/Bank employee. **Dorothy F. Bridgeman,** 457 Myra Way, Secretary. **Alphred R. Springs,** 150 Marietta Drive, Military Personnel Technician, Federal Civil Service. **Richard A. Evers,** 7 Gaviota Way, Minister of the Gospel. **Hazel E Hurd,** 558 Flood Ave., Retired - Retail Clerk. **Barbara Gaar,** 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife. **Joseph M. Salcido,** 965 Teresita Blvd., Retired City Employee.

SODONIA M. WILSON, PH.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education; Education/College Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I have served four years on the Board of Education—two as Vice President. I have seventeen years of experience in education in administration, teaching, counseling, early childhood education, special education, bilingual education, and continuing education.

I have developed Board policies to address the academic needs of our diverse student population which would assist our students in preparing for higher education, and for employment in the 21st Century. I have also worked for increased parent involvement in the schools.

We must continue to identify the needs of our diverse student population, and do everything we can to meet those needs.

Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Sodonia Wilson are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman. **Robert Barnes,** 28 Florentine St., Personnel Manager. **Al Borvice,** 234 Gates St., Attorney. **Harry G. Britt,** 1392 Page St., Supervisor. **Rev. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor/Trustee, Community College Board. **Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.,** 1200 Gough St., Legislative/Lawyer. **Sala Burton,** 8 Sloat Blvd., Representative in Congress. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Dianne Feinstein,** 30 Presidio Ter., Mayor of San Francisco. **Naomi T. Gray,** 1291 Stanyan St., Health Commissioner. **Grandvel A. Jackson,** 257 Kensington Way, Pres. NAACP. **Frederick E. Jordan,** 230 Cresta Vista Drive, Civil Engineer. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Leroy King,** 75 Zampa Lane, Reg. Dir. ILWU. **Bill Maher,** 69 Elsie St., Supervisor. **Enola D. Maxwell,** 1559 Jerrold Ave., Exec. Director. **John L. Molinari,** 30 16th Ave., President, Board of Supervisors. **Wendy Nelder,** 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor. **Louise H. Renne,** 3725 Jackson St., City Attorney. **Joan-Marie Shelley,** 895 Burnett Ave., Union President. **Arlo Smith,** 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Assist. to Rep. Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent. **Arelious Walker,** 1143 Gilman Ave., Pastor. **Doris M. Ward,** 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor. **Nancy G. Walker,** 355 Green St., Supervisor. **Elouise Westbrook,** 152 Maddux Ave., Community Activist. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister.

LELAND YEE, PH.D.

My address is 1489 Dolores Street
My occupation is Parent/Educator
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an educator, child psychologist, and parent with three children enrolled in the San Francisco public schools. I, like other parents, have had to camp out or go through a trial-and-error process of selecting an appropriate school. These conditions cannot continue! With 20 years of experience educating, motivating and counseling students from diverse cultural backgrounds and different learning needs, my emphasis will be on quality education to meet the needs of all children. I will bring to the Board dedication to serve children. I will make decisions based on educational needs rather than personal politics.

Leland Yee

The sponsors for Leland Yee are:

J. E. Brainin-Rodriguez, 80 Peralta Ave., Physician/Parent. **Dr. Amos C. Brown,** 111 Lunado Way, Pastor, Vice President Community College Governing Board. **Lewis H. Butler,** 44 Commonwealth Ave., College Professor. **James Corey Busch,** 2105 Buchanan St., Sports Executive. **Eileen Caplan,** 1859 26th Ave., Community Activist. **Agripino R. Cerbatos,** 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer. **John Yehall Chin,** 3146 Lyon St., School Principal. **Harry J. Chuck,** 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Minister. **Henry Der,** 726 32nd Ave., Executive Director. **Steven J. Doi,** 1521 Larkin St., Attorney. **Aileen C. Hernandez,** 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant. **Isabel Huie,** 1573 Clay St., Executive Director/Commissioner. **Johnnie B. Johnson,** 10 Quickstep Lane, Businesswoman. **Willie B. Kennedy,** 950 Duncan St., Supervisor. **Ann Blumlein Lazarus,** 65 5th Ave., Businessman. **Rev. James Leach,** 195 Borica Way, Minister. **Jeffery Ken Mori,** 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council. **Peter J. Nardoza,** 4086 26th St., Administrator. **Gina Pennestri,** 1324 Clayton St., Administrative Assistant. **Lawrence J. Simi,** 358 Ulloa St., Parent. **Doris R. Thomas,** 1293 Stanyan St., Adm. Assist. to Rep. Sala Burton. **Benjamin Tom,** 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, SF Board of Education. **Marie Tourlos,** 515 47th Ave., Union Official. **Yori Wada,** 565 4th Ave. U.C. Regent. **Ron Wakabayashi,** 1840 Anza St., National Director, Japanese American Citizens League. **L. Ling-Chi Wang,** 2479 Post St., UC Professor. **A. Cecil Williams,** 60 Hiliritas Ave., Minister. **Hannibal A. Williams,** 1249 Scott St., Clergy (Presbyterian). **Sodonia M. Wilson,** 540 Darien Way, College Administrator.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

PROPOSITION A

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco.

YES 273
NO 274

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, the San Francisco Fire Department has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1977 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure firefighting water system which operates independently from the City's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the City which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would authorize the City to borrow $46,200,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for improvements in San Francisco's fire protection system. These improvements would include extending the high pressure system, construction of new cisterns in residential areas, installation of a high pressure pump station at Lake Merced, construction of an emergency operations center, and other projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling $46,200,000 to make certain improvements in the City's fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for these improvements in the City's fire protection system.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Resolution be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty **(20) year basis** and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be:

Bond Redemption	$46,200,000
Bond Interest	38,808,000
Debt Service Requirement	$85,008,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for **twenty-two (22) years** would be $3,864,000 which amount is equivalent to approximately one and twenty hundreths cents ($0.0120) in the current tax rate."

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 and August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 in favor of the ordinance placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The ordinance was signed by Mayor Dianne Feinstein on August 6.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 96

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION A

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In 1906, as dawn was about to break on April 18, a giant earthquake hit the City, touching off 52 separate fires. Those downtown swiftly joined in a huge conflagration that swept westward from the waterfront, leaving much of the City in ruins.

If another major quake strikes—(and seismic experts say it will, but they can't pinpoint when), the City must be prepared.

Our firefighters must have sufficient water to fight spreading fires and quickly to control them. That's the only way our City will survive.

In 1906, water mains broke and left the City defenseless.

Proposition A will assure adequate water in every neighborhood throughout the City.

Proposition A will provide $46 million in general obligation bonds to expand and improve emergency water supplies throughout the City. Residential areas will be provided with underground cisterns, and the high-pressure water supply system will be extended. Suction hose connections to City lakes, San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean will provide additional millions of gallons of water.

These emergency fire-fighting water supplies are necessary to protect our homes, schools, hospitals, churches and other structures from the threat of fire that inevitably comes with a monstrous quake.

This increased fire protection will benefit the entire City and all who live, work and vist here.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As a result of the earthquake and fire in 1906, San Francisco suffered great destruction and devastation from the conflagration which followed, including the destruction of 28,000 buildings.

Due to broken water mains caused by the earthquake, the San Francisco Fire Department was unable to stop the fire from getting out of control.

Proposition A will provide for the expansion of a high pressure fire-fighting water system to the residential districts of the City, which will be critical in emergency situations.

Underground cisterns also will be constructed in the outer residential districts to provide emergency water supply in areas not served by the high pressure system.

High pressure system gate valves will be motorized with emergency battery powerpacks so they can be opened and closed in an emergency when normal power is disrupted.

Suction connections will be provided to San Francisco Bay, the Pacific Ocean, and City lakes so that fire department pumpers can quickly connect and pump water from these large bodies of water to any fires.

A pumping station for the high pressure system will be constructed at Lake Merced to provide an important source of water from the western part of the City.

An Emergency Operations Center will be built to provide a command center for operations in earthquakes and other major disasters.

The recent fire and explosion in the Hunter's Point district demonstrated the critical need for water supplies in a major fire. The broken water main caused by the explosion severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this major fire. This is an example of what can happen when normal water supplies are disrupted.

Increased earthquake activity in California demonstrates the importance of this Proposition.

The fire department can function only if an adequate water supply exists. Proposition A will provide an emergency fire-fighting water supply for the City, and ensure that fires will not get out of control due to lack of water, following an earthquake.

We urge all citizens to vote yes on Proposition A. This is protection for your home and your City.

—Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The Fire Commission and Chief of Department urge a YES vote on Propositon A—a $46.2 million Earthquake Preparedness Program.

This construction Program is designed to provide an updated and expanded emergency water supply system so that all areas of the City and County of San Francisco will be protected in case of a conflagration following an earthquake or other disaster.

The major components of the Program are: high-pressure water supply extensions, underground cisterns, pumping station, emergency operations center, suction hose connections to the Bay and lakes, and a study to determine fire station reconstruction needs and their earthquake safety.

Help the San Francisco Fire Department provide increased fire protection. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Henry E. Berman, President, Fire Commission
Curtis McClain, Vice President, Fire Commission
Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Anne S. Howden, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Emmet D. Condon, Chief of Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans will not forget, nor should they, the tragic Bayview/Hunter's Point fire on April 4, 1986. Coincidentally, two earthquakes rocked the Bay Area in the weeks following the Bayview fire.

Following the Bayview fire, I requested Board of Supervisors hearings to investigate the adequacy of San Francisco's emergency water supply in the Bayview, Ingleside, Balboa Terrace, Oceanview, Lakeside, Forest Hill, Crocker-Amazon, St. Francis Wood, West Portal, Diamond Heights, Visitacion Valley, Merced Manor, Excelsior, Portola, Silver Terrace, Miraloma Park, Forest Knolls, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore Acres, Monterey Heights, and Outer Mission neighborhoods, and to implement a program to correct deficiencies in our emergency firefighting capabilities. From these hearings and deliberations of the Fire Commission, Proposition A emerged.

VOTE YES ON A.

Proposition A is a $46,200,000 general obligation bond issue to construct a comprehensive emergency water supply system and an emergency operations center for firefighting in the event of a disaster.

That may seem like a lot of money, but it represents, in this case, a prudent, far-sighted investment in San Francisco's future. Unfortunately, we can't guarantee another Bayview-type fire won't happen. But we can be better prepared if one **does** happen, and significantly reduce the risk to life and property in the Bayview, Hunter's Point, the Outer Mission, and all of the West of Twin Peaks area.

Please vote "Yes" on A.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquakes are a major concern to all of us who live in California, and a potential cause of disaster for San Francisco. Following a major earthquake it is highly likely that multiple fires will occur. San Francisco with its highly congested blocks of wooden buildings would face a conflagration (fire storm), if a major earthquake caused water supplies to be disrupted.

Proposition A, as an Earthquake Preparedness measure, is very important for San Francisco. It will provide for Emergency Water Supply necessary for fire fighting.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Bruce Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Karl V. Steinbrugge, Past Chairman
California Seismic Safety Commission
Charles Scawthorn, Structural Engineer
Joe J. Litehiser, Seismologist
Donald H. Cheu, M.D., Vice Chairman
Governor's Earthquake Task Force

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We support this important Earthquake Preparedness Program.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Morris Bernstein, President, Airports Commission
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
E. L. Friend, President
Anne Halstead, Commissioner, Port Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Melvin D. Lee, Commissioner, Redevelopment Commission
Robert J. McCarthy, Vice President, Board of Permit Appeals
Al Nelder, Commissioner, Police Commission
Michael Salarno, Member, S.F. Parking Commission
William K. Coblentz, Attorney
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney
Steven L. Swig, Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection for San Francisco's neighborhoods is a vital factor. Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting are necessary so that the Fire Department can provide ample protection to our homes in the event an earthquake damages water mains as occurred in 1906.

Proposition A will expand and improve the Fire Department's Emergency Water Supplies.

- Suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- Underground cisterns will be provided in residential areas.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to outer residential districts.

The cost of Proposition A is .0120 cent per $100 valuation on the property tax; this means a home valued at $150,000 would pay $17.16 per year for this protection. This is highly cost effective insurance for our homes.

We urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Marguerite A. Warren
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Dorothy Agnes McDougall
Andrew Jones
George L. Newkirk
Jess T. Esteva
Dolph Andrews
Norman V. Wechsler

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection and Earthquake Preparedness concern all school officials in San Francisco.

Proposition A is an important program that will provide **Emergency Water Supplies For Fire Fighting** throughout the City.

When a major earthquake strikes, the Fire Department must have a dependable water supply to protect our families, homes and schools.

Earthquakes cannot be stopped, but we must have water to stop the fires that will occur.

We ask all citizens to join us and **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

Myra A. Kopf, President, Board of Education
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Benjamin Tom, Member, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, President, S.F. Community College Board
Al Vidal, Principal, Washington High School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Improved and expanded Emergency Water Supplies for fire fighting in San Francisco are a necessary factor to prevent another conflagration (fire storm) from sweeping the City as occurred in 1906.

Our central business and financial districts are the economic heart of the City, the residential districts contain the homes of our citizens.

Proposition A provides increased fire protection to our high-rise buildings and our homes.

Earthquake preparedness and protection from the ravages of fire concern us all. As civic leaders of San Francisco we urge all citizens to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITON A.**

Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association
James R. Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We can bet that most of you have seen the circles of bricks encompassing certain intersections in some neighborhoods in San Francisco. These circles mark underground water cisterns that were constructed "after" the devastating earthquake and fire in 1906. Many neighborhoods in San Francisco built after 1912 are NOT serviced by this alternate water system.

Proposition A would provide a City-wide emergency water supply system to protect our homes and neighborhoods.

We cannot prevent earthquakes but we can take precaution against fire. . . the biggest threat to San Francisco.

We urge a **YES** vote on Proposition A. . . fire protection for our families no matter where they may be in our City.

Nancy Honig
Roxanne Mankin
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Bernice E. Ayala
Cheryl Arenson
Gina Moscone
Jonnie B. Johnson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and increased fire protection are of vital concern to all citizens of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Robert Bacci
Michael Bernick
Susan Bierman
Frank T. Blackburn
Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown
Sally Brunn
Stafford Buckley
Michael Chan
Charles D. Cresci
Rosemary DeGregorio
Todd Dickinson
H. Welton Flynn
Ron Huberman
Ralph Hurtado
David Jenkins
Agar Jaicks
Carole Migden
Polly V. Marshall
Alicia Wang
Thomas F. McDonough
Tony Kilroy
Leroy King
David Looman
Christopher Martin
Peter Mezey
Marilyn Miller
Jeff Mori
Sandy Mori
Yoshio Nakashima
Mitchell Omerberg
Edward J. Phipps
Linda Post
Thelma Shelley
Robert J. Tully
Yori Wada
Evelyn Wilson
Pansy Panzio Waller
Bruce W. Lilienthal
Jim Wachob

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Pure self interest dictates that we provide an abundant and surplus supply of "fire protection" water for EVERY part of San Francisco, not just half of it! VOTE YES!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Fire Protection Bonds A

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Emergency water supplies for fire fighting are vital for San Francisco. On April 4, 1986, an explosion and fire occurred in the Bayview District, causing nine deaths. The disrupted water supply caused by the explosion, severely hampered the Fire Department in controlling this fire.

In the event of a major earthquake it is highly likely that water mains will be damaged throughout San Francisco. Proposition A will provide for 94 underground cisterns to be built in residential areas where few emergency water supplies now exist. The Bayview fire demonstrated the need for emergency water supplies for fire fighting.

Protect your neighborhood and home.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Concerned Citizens for Improved Fire Protection

Michael Frew, Chairman
John Holt
Robert L. Kreuzberger
Ed F. Patterson
Michael S. Newman
Mel S. Newman
Jack R. Brower
August J. Nevolo

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Franciscans remember what happened in 1906. The fires that occurred after the earthquake swept the City and left many thousands of people homeless.

Proposition A is a common sense program to provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** throughout the City. This would ensure that fires would not get out of control due to lack of water supply.

This $46.2 million bond issue needs a two-thirds vote. As a former member of the Board of Supervisors and neighborhood businessman, I urge all citizens to vote for this important program. It is protection for your family, home and city at a very low cost; it makes sense in both human and economic terms.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John Barbagelata, Realtor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A assures San Francisco residents of on-going preparation which is the best defense against a major disaster—earthquake, conflagration, or an explosion.

San Francisco Fire Fighters regard this measure as the first-step in the earthquake preparedness program.

Control disaster with expanded fire protection!

San Francisco Fire Fighters urges a **YES** vote on Proposition A.

James T. Ferguson, President,
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire Protection is a serious concern for all citizens of San Francisco. We, the working Fire Chiefs of San Francisco are well aware of what happened in 1906, when fires occurring after the great earthquake burned thousands of buildings and left over 200,000 homeless.

The quake caused hundreds of breaks in water mains and the lack of water supplies prevented the Fire Department from controlling the fire.

We do not want this to happen again.

Proposition A will provide **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting.** The following installations will be placed in our neighborhoods to protect our homes.

- 94 underground cisterns will be built.
- 56 suction hose connections for pumpers will be provided to City lakes, S.F. Bay and Pacific Ocean.
- The High-Pressure System will be extended to residential areas.
- Improvements to tanks, reservoirs, pump stations, including a new pump station at Lake Merced and an Emergency Operations Center.

The recent fire in the Bayview District that took nine lives demonstrated how important water supplies can be. The damaged water supply caused by the fire and explosion seriously hampered Fire Department efforts to control this major fire.

We as the working Fire Chiefs who actually run the day-to-day field operations in San Francisco urge all citizens to support this important measure.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

John W. Flaherty
President, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Gary J. Torres
Secretary, The San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fire safety can be improved by voting FOR Proposition A and AGAINST BART director Eugene Garfinkle. BART's a fire trap.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

A Fire Protection Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and Fire Protection are vital factors for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

A. Cecil Williams, Glide United Methodist Church
Bob Barry, President, S.F. Police Officers Association
William Corvin, President, California Steam Company
J. M. Eaneman, President, AMC Cancer Research Board of Directors
George Foos, Chairman, Great Western Value Centers
Rev. John L. Green, Chaplain, S.F. Fire Department
Albert S. Samuels, Jr., Past President, Market Street Project
Harvey Matthews, Bayview-Hunter's Point Democratic Club
Arthur Goedewaagen, President, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Prior to the Great Earthquake and Fire of 1906, San Francisco Fire Chiefs had always insisted the City was not prepared for a major disaster. History proved them correct. Today, 80 years later, San Francisco's preparation is still not adequate.

When each of us was Chief of Department, we emphasized the need for the additional preparedness necessary to prevent a sweeping fire storm or catastrophic disaster. That state of preparedness has yet to be attained. However, Proposition A offers a once-in-a-life opportunity to protect life and property, through preparation, at an extremely minimal cost. This opportunity should not be missed.

Proposition A will provide the necessary water supplies vital to preventing another conflagration of the 1906 magnitude!

Proposition A will expand the high-pressure firefighting water supply system beyond the commercial areas into the residential neighborhoods!

Proposition A will greatly improve fire defenses not only in the western part of San Francisco but City-wide as well!

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco is no longer one of the few remaining major cities with a sub-standard Emergency Operations Center for command and control during disasters and earthquakes!

As former San Francisco Fire Chiefs, we urge you to **VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A.**

William F. Murray, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Keith P. Calden, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired
Andrew C. Casper, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department, Retired

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

- Yes on Proposition A.
- Local fire chiefs have warned about grave BART fire catastrophe dangers. End disregard of public safety.

—San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This is a vital issue for San Francisco. **Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting** must be provided throughout the City.

Many fires will occur if a major earthquake strikes San Francisco.

The Fire Department needs a water suply to prevent a conflagration (fire storm) from occurring again, as it did in 1906.

Earthquakes are a geologic fact of life and cannot be prevented, but we can prepare for the fires that will occur, this makes sense for all citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Philip S. Day, Jr.
Director, San Francisco Office of Emergency Services
Richard Eisner, Earthquake Preparedness Consultant
Jelena Pantelic, Chairperson, Disaster Preparedness Committee
Joe Posillico, Emergency Services, Salvation Army
Peter Ashen, Disaster Director, American Red Cross

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations endorsements:
Proposition A—YES
Proposition M—YES

Terence Faulkner
President, San Francisco Council of Civic Organizations

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Earthquake Preparedness and providing Emergency Water Supplies for Fire Fighting are of vital importance to San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Donald J. Birrer, Director of Public Works
Frank M. Jordan, Chief of Police
Dean Macris, Director of Planning
Rudy Nothenberg, General Manager, Public Utilities
William Stead, General Manager, Municipal Railway
David Werdegar, M.D.M.P.H., Director of Public Health
James D. Cooney, General Manager, S.F. Water Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

PROPOSITION B

Shall the City construct additions to the Moscone Convention Center, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency in an amount not to exceed $140,000,000?

YES 276 ➡
NO 277 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has built and now operates the Moscone Convention Center on land leased from the Redevelopment Agency. The Center is paid for from the City's hotel room tax. The Center is located in the Agency's Yerba Buena redevelopment area.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center. The additions could not interfere with the Yerba Buena redevelopment project. The additions would be paid for by lease revenue bonds issued by the Redevelopment Agency, in an amount no more than $140 million. The bonds would be paid for by the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds. The bonds would be paid for from the City's general fund, which would be paid back by the hotel room tax.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to build additions to the Moscone Convention Center using Redevelopment Agency bonds.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Resolution be adopted and implemented, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the project cost and lease revenue financing. Based on an assumption that the construction cost is $140 million, in my opinion, the approximate costs of the lease revenue financing would be as follows:

Bond Redemption	$140,000,000
Bond Interest	145,600,000
Debt Service Requirement	$285,600,000

"Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty-five (25) years would be approximately $11,424,000 which amount is equivalent to three and fifty-four hundreths ($0.0354) cents in the current tax rate.

"It is anticipated that lease payments made from the General Fund will be reimbursed from an increase in the Hotel Tax."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 46

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's reputation as "Everybody's Favorite City" each year attracts millions of tourists, convention delegates and trade show participants. These visitors spend more than $1,500,000,000 here annually, and their expenditures sustain more than 60,000 jobs.

Visitors to San Francisco not only form the backbone of our local economy, they also provide vital support for many of the cultural opportunities that enhance the quality of life for all San Francisco residents.

Moscone Center, the centerpiece of San Francisco's convention industry, lacks sufficient exhibit space to attract the larger conventions and trade shows that are becoming more popular. Many associations no longer will consider San Francisco as a site for their future conventions, and many groups that have held conventions here will not consider returning—solely because Moscone Center is not large enough to accommodate their needs.

Studies have shown that unless we expand Moscone Center, up to 150,000 annual convention visitors will go to other West Coast cities, rather than coming to San Francisco. Losing their $150,000,000 worth of annual business would be a serious setback to the San Francisco economy.

Proposition B will permit Moscone Center to nearly double in size, AT NO COST TO SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS.

A modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors, to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, will generate more than enough revenue to pay for the proposed expansion.

Plus, the larger conventions attracted by the enlarged facilities will generate more business and more tax revenue for the city as a whole.

The proposed expansion will preserve the plans for Yerba Buena Gardens; the additional exhibit hall will be built underground, beneath the Gardens.

Proposition B will enable San Francisco to compete for the larger and more prestigious conventions and trade shows well into the next century.

Proposition B is good for jobs, good for business, good for the community and good for the future.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors agrees unanimously—one of San Francisco's most important industries is in danger.

Unless we act NOW, by 1992 San Francisco will lose 150,000 convention visitors annually—a significant percentage of our convention business.

Losing 150,000 visitors means losing $150,000,000 worth of business annually—a severe blow to our economy that would affect ALL San Franciscans.

Why do we face this crisis? Because Moscone Center lacks sufficient exhibit space to accommodate the larger national conventions and trade shows.

Conventions nationwide are attracting more participants and more exhibitors. Unless San Francisco expands its meeting facilities, San Francisco's declining share of the market will decrease even more rapidly.

Many associations that have met here in the past have stated they would like to return, but they cannot because of a lack of space. And with convention center expansions underway in several West Coast cities, San Francisco will have even more difficulty competing for a healthy share in this business.

The Board of Supervisors doesn't often agree unanimously— but we all agree that Proposition B will restore San Francisco's competitive edge in the convention market.

And the most attractive aspect of Proposition B is that it won't cost San Francisco taxpayers a cent!

If Proposition B is approved by the voters, the Board will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors. Independent studies and financial analyses show clearly that this tax will more than pay for the Moscone Center expansion.

Propositon B is a key element in long-range plans to insure the economic vitality of our City.

The Board of Supervisors unanimously urges you to vote YES on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist industry, the leading business in San Francisco, supplies more jobs to San Franciscans than any other industry. Approximately 60,000 people are employed in the hospitality industry. The industry is extremely competitive. Cities all over the United States are voracious in their efforts to win conventions and visitors from San Francisco. Las Vegas, San Diego, New York, and even Anaheim, offer better, larger, more comprehensive facilities. The long and short of it is that we have outgrown Moscone Center and need additional convention space. That's the reason for Proposition B.

As Chairman of our Super Bowl Task Force which put on Super Bowl XIX, I can tell you how important the hospitality industry is to our City and its future. Just as that event generated, according to the Budget Analyst, approximately $1,000,000 in tax money alone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

for the City's General Fund, similar, and even lesser events, generate annually about $70,000,000 in tax revenue for the City's coffers. Make no mistake about it, over $500,000,000 is estimated to be spent each year by conventioneers in San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON B.

With this bond issue we will generate the money needed to build an underground addition to the existing facilities at no cost to local taxpayers. The bonds will be liquidated with revenue from an increase in the hotel room tax paid by tourists and conventioneers.

I strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition B because it is necessary for the economic well-being of San Francisco and San Franciscans.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B. The jobs of thousands of our fellow San Franciscans could depend on it.

Moscone Convention Center is the linchpin of our City's convention and visitor industry. Expanding the facility is vital to keeping our tourism industry—an industry which employs more than 45,000 men and women in San Francisco alone—viable and strong.

Extensive, independent studies conclude expansion is necessary to keep San Francisco current and competitive in the national convention industry picture. The studies show that the number of conventioneers to visit San Francisco will drop without an expansion to accommodate them. Top-spending conventioneers will be siphoned off by our West Coast competitors who are already expanding to accommodate their meeting room and exhibit space needs.

The visitor industry has changed so fast and so unpredictably that many large, affluent trade associations and visitor groups have already outgrown Moscone Convention Center. The proposed changes in meeting rooms and exhibit hall space should accommodate the industry's needs well into the 21st century. The expansion will take place underground—with minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood or to the planned Yerba Buena Gardens.

Best of all, the proposed expansion will cost San Francisco taxpayers nothing. The expansion will be financed entirely by San Francisco's visitors. A minimal increase in the tax on hotel rooms will be used to pay back the bonds needed to fund construction costs. Proposition B asks for the authority to issue construction bonds.

A **yes vote** on B is in the best interests of all San Franciscans. I urge you to join us in protecting San Francisco's future.

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If we are serious about remaining competitive in the Convention industry we must look toward the future and plan for an expanded Convention Center.

Proposition B will allow us to expand the Moscone Center without costing San Franciscans any money.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $150,000,000 in annual convention business that might otherwise go to other cities.

Proposition B will help San Francisco retain $2,000,000 in annual local tax revenues that could be lost without the expansion.

San Francisco will sustain thousands of jobs that otherwise might be jeopardized.

The proposed Yerba Buena Gardens open space and cultural plan will remain for the enjoyment of all San Franciscans.

Proposition B will benefit San Francisco in many ways—at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers. It's a good idea that deserves our support.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Tourism is San Francisco's number one industry, and it is currently in jeopardy.

Conventions promote tourism which promotes the businesses which provide jobs to San Franciscans and pay taxes into the general fund. The tax base funds San Francisco's essential services such as police and fire protection, health services and senior programs.

If our convention facilities can't compete with other cities' and business goes elsewhere, the result is more local unemployment and fewer services for San Franciscans.

Support the expansion of Moscone Center. Vote YES on Propositon B.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When it was built, Moscone Center was the end product of decades of planning to establish San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of America's convention and trade show industry.

Moscone Center is the centerpiece of an industry that each year brings more than $500,000,000 in revenues to San Francisco's economy and contributes more than $12,500,000 in local taxes. This revenue sustains tens of thousands of jobs and enhances the quality of life for everyone in San Francisco.

Since Moscone Center was designed and built, the convention and trade show industry has undergone major changes. Conventions now involve many more participants and require much more exhibit space, and trends point toward even larger events in the future.

Comprehensive marketing surveys, including extensive interviews with convention planners, show clearly that Moscone Center no longer will be able to accommodate the needs of the larger and more profitable conventions and shows. Other California cities, including San Diego and Anaheim, and also Las Vegas, are currently enlarging their convention facilities, to present even greater competition to San Francisco in the future.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, within 6 years we will lose $150,000,000 worth of convention business, and ALL San Franciscans will suffer as a result.

Proposition B is our best hope to sustain the dream we started more than two decades ago.

Propostion B will assure the future health of one of our City's most important industries.

Proposition B WILL NOT COST SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ANYTHING. A small increase in the hotel tax paid by visitors would more than pay for the expansion plan.

Let's protect our investment and maintain our ability to participate in a highly competitive market.

Let's vote YES on B!

George Christopher, Former Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention industry means more to San Francisco than the $510,000,000 annually it contributes to our economy, the $12,500,000 in local taxes it contributes, or the thousands of jobs it sustains.

The convention industry plays a large role in establishing San Francisco's worldwide reputation as a center for tourism, commerce, finance, culture and ideas.

The importance of our being able to accommodate the largest, most prestigious and profitable conventions and trade shows extends throughout the social and economic fabric of our community.

Moscone Center is the focus of our convention and trade show industry, and rapid changes in the nature of the industry are quickly making Moscone Center obsolete. Conventions and trade exhibits are getting larger and require more space than they did when Moscone Center was designed and built.

San Francisco competes with other West Coast cities for convention business, and many of these cities have convention center expansion projects underway. If we don't expand Moscone Center, independent studies have shown that we will lose 150,000 convention visitors and $150,000,000 in convention-generated revenues annually.

Plus, we will lose our place in the upper ranks of our nation's convention industry.

There's a lot at stake for San Francisco's future. And fortunately, we can secure the future at no cost to San Francisco taxpayers.

Proposition B will protect thousands of jobs, hundreds of millions of dollars in local economic benefits that affect **all** San Franciscans, and millions of dollars of local tax revenues. Proposition B will keep Moscone Center competitive well into the next century.

Please join me in voting **YES on Proposition B.**

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The tourist and convention and trade show industries sustain approximately 60,000 jobs, a vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

And a high percentage of these jobs in hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation and other direct visitor-serving businesses are held by minority men and women. The livelihoods of thousands of San Francisco taxpaying families depend on the health of our convention industry.

Vote YES on B to preserve much-needed opportunities for employment and advancement.

Vote YES on B to keep our city's economy strong.

Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Jim Gonzalez, Mayor's Special Assistant
Julie Tang, Member, College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Jeff Mori, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention and tourism industry sustains more than 60,000 jobs in San Francisco, the vast majority of which are held by San Francisco residents.

These jobs include a wide spectrum of professions and trades: restaurant and hotel workers; barbers and beauticians; service employees (including janitors); shopkeepers and retail clerks; plumbers, electricians, carpenters, stage hands, trade show installers, teamsters, sign and house painters and other building trades; bus drivers and taxi drivers; accountants; printers; tour guides; artists and performers; maintenance crews; airline workers—the list goes on—because convention business is everywhere! And the vast majority of these workers are San Franciscans.

Proposition B will prevent San Francisco from losing $150,000,000 in annual convention business—money that circulates everywhere in our city's economy and benefits ALL of our residents.

SAVE JOBS! VOTE YES ON B!

Walter Johnson, S.F. Labor Council
Mike Hardeman, Sign, Display Union Local 510
Ben Leal, Teamsters Local 856
Jim Ferguson, S.F. Firefighters 798
Paul Varacalli, United Public Employees Local 790
Bob Barry, Police Officers Association
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
John Moylan, Plasterers & Shophands Union Local 66
Jeffrey Greendorfer, S.F. Labor Council
George Ando, Laborers Union Local 261
Stanley Smith, S.F. Building Trades Council
Robert Morales, Teamsters Local 350
James Herman, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Leroy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
Jack Henning, California Labor Federation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is a wise investment in San Francisco's future.

Proposition B will keep $150,000,000 a year flowing through our local economy, and will keep us from losing $3,000,000 a year in local tax revenue.

Best of all, Proposition B won't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything!

Keep San Francisco where we belong—at the head of our nation's convention and trade show industry.

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Ed Lawson, Former Supervisor
Lee Dolson, Former Supervisor
Emily Pike, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party
Dolph Andrews, Former Chair, S.F. Republican Party

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center and the convention industry are vital to San Francisco's economy and job market.

As the highly competitive convention and trade show industry changes, San Francisco must move quickly and decisively to retain its position as an industry leader.

The Proposition B plan to expand Moscone Center will insure that San Francisco will be able to accommodate the larger, more prestigious and more profitable conventions well into the next century.

Proposition B is a sensible plan that enhances the South of Market environment, protects more than 60,000 jobs and doesn't cost San Francisco taxpayers anything.

Vote to protect a crucial part of our city's livelihood. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Art Agnos, Assemblyman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Milton Marks, State Senator
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The convention center named in honor of my husband, Mayor George Moscone, established San Francisco firmly in the front ranks of the nation's convention and trade show cities.

George's greatest source of pride in getting the long-delayed project underway was the convention center's tremendous contribution to our city's economy and the livelihood it provides for thousands of San Franciscans.

Proposition B insures that the people of San Francisco will continue to enjoy the benefits of a thriving convention industry, and that Moscone Center will continue to accommodate the nation's most prestigious conventions and trade shows.

I hope you will join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

Gina Moscone

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B is extremely important to San Francisco taxpayers.

Without Proposition B, San Francisco stands to lose a total of approximately $150,000,000 worth of business annually, and $3,000,000 annually in local tax revenue.

If the voters approve Proposition B, the Board of Supervisors will enact a modest increase in the hotel tax—a tax paid only by visitors to San Francisco—which will more than pay for the expansion of Moscone Center.

Therefore, **Proposition B will NOT increase taxes paid by San Francisco residents.**

Proposition B presents a rare opportunity to strengthen the tax base of our city without burdening the taxpayers who live here.

Vote YES on B!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

This proposition offers the voters the opportunity to make a positive statement on behalf of the city's economy.

The convention element of the visitor industry represents more than 34% of the dollars spent by city visitors. These dollars create thousands of jobs for city residents, generate millions of dollars for the city treasury, and support businesses throughout the city.

Unless we are able to expand the Moscone Convention Center, we will lose anually about 150,000 convention attendees. Thousands of jobs, city revenues and health will be jeopardized by the loss of this convention business.

The Moscone Convention Center has inadequate exhibition and meeting space to meet the requirements of a substantial number of current clients. The associations sponsoring the conventions have grown rapidly in the past few years, both in terms of attendees and exhibitors. These associations are informing the city that they will not return or are cancelling dates in coming years. Other cities such as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Las Vegas are expanding their convention facilities to meet the growth in the market place. To retain our current market share, we must expand the Moscone Convention Center.

The expansion of the city's convention facilities will be financed by hotel tax revenues. It will not cost city taxpayers anything.

The proposition contains language to protect the Yerba Buena Gardens open space, cultural and commercial elements. The undergrounding of the convention facility expansion will not disrupt any of the other program elements. In many respects, the center design concept will enhance and enlarge the open space and facilitate traffic movement in the area.

We encourage you to vote yes on Proposition B.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
James Bronkema, President, Embarcadero Center
Robert Wilhelm, Managing Director, Westin St. Francis Hotel
Lee Dolson, General Manager, Downtown Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON B

Discussions of the economic benefits of San Francisco's convention industry usually focus on the obvious beneficiaries—the large hotels and restaurants.

Let's not forget how important convention visitors are to the thousands of small businesses—the dry cleaning shops, the florists, the barber shops and hairdressers, the printers, typesetting and graphics studios, cab drivers, newsstand operators, photographers, boutiques, street artists, temporary employment agencies, public relations firms, sandwich shops, theatres, car rental agencies—located throughout San Francisco's neighborhoods.

The vitality of San Francisco's convention industry is crucial to thousands of small businesses and the people they employ. That's why we urge a YES vote on Proposition B.

Bruce Lilienthal, Chair, Small Business Advisory Committee
Barbara Cappa, Small Business Owner
Peter G. Hanson, Small Business Leader

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Keep San Francisco's convention business thriving—well into the next century.

Don't let $150,000,000 per year slip away to other cities. Keep it here to nourish our economy, protect thousands of jobs, and generate millions of tax dollars for our city treasury.

As Republicans, we support this sensible, forward-looking proposition.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Members, Republican County Central Committee

Terence Faulkner
Lisa Klobucar
Robert Silvestri
Stanley Bramwell
Tom Spinosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Moscone Center Financing B

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Moscone Center is a community resource that needs expansion and further enhancement for San Francisco to maintain its competitive environment for the important tourist and convention industry.

We support the undergrounding of Howard Street, expanding space for the above-ground art facilities and pedestrian mall, and encourage the use of Hotel Tax rather than General funds for improvements to the Center.

An improved Moscone Center is good business, good economics, and good sense for San Francisco and its citizens. Join us in voting YES on Prop B.

Roberto Esteves, President
and the members of Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Our pride in San Francisco was never higher than when we hosted the 1984 Democratic National Convention at Moscone Center.

San Francisco is one of America's favorite cities for conventions and trade shows. But their ever-increasing requirements for exhibit space means that Moscone Center is able to accommodate fewer large events every year.

Unless we enlarge Moscone Center, we will have 150,000 fewer convention visitors each year. The consequences would be a serious blow to our city's pride and to our economy.

Proposition B is good for jobs and business. Proposition B is environmentally compatible with the nearby South of Market residential neighborhoods.

Proposition B will keep San Francisco at the top as one of America's most popular convention and trade show cities.

Join us in voting YES on B.

Members, Democratic County Central Committee

Carole Migden
Linda Post
Louise Minnick
Sal Rosselli
Ron Huberman
Lulu Carter
Arlo Hale Smith
Christopher Martin
Ed McGovern
Bob Geary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

Here we go again. More piecemeal planning by City Hall. First it was Brooks Hall in Civic Center. Then we agreed to a compromise and Moscone Convention Center was built. Today the BIG hotels and special interest groups want the City to make Moscone twice as big as it is now. More traffic, more big trucks driving through our neighborhoods and double parking on our streets, more congestion, more gridlock. When will it stop.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

This is just a BIG hotel bailout. They built too many expensive rooms. Now they can't fill them. Public funds from the hotel tax should be used to reduce your property taxes and improve City services. More jobs can be created by spending this tax money elsewhere in our community. Do not subsidize an overbuilt hotel industry.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

You and I and our children will be at risk and we will have to pay back the $140,000,000 if the hotel tax is not enough.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
District One Political Action
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Ruth and Jim Gravanis
Tony Kilroy
Jack Morrison, Social Services Commissioner
Dorice Murphy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Yerba Buena Gardens development involved years and years of public debate. Mayors appointed citizen committees to work out designs, develop housing and open space plans, and resolve critical questions and issues. It was a long time coming, but we San Franciscans finally agreed on a project that will be good for the city.

Now the big hotels want *you* to build them another convention center and delay Yerba Buena Gardens another four years. Moscone Center is only five years old, but they want you to believe it's already outdated.

They have no designs for the new convention center and no reliable estimate of its costs. They don't even have a financing plan that doesn't count on public funds.

After years and years of public hearings, public debate and, finally, public agreement, why vote for a measure that was rushed through the Board of Supervisors in only two weeks?

B is for bad faith.

Vote NO.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

B Moscone Center Financing

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

B is for bailout.

This is a $200 million bailout for San Francisco's big hotels. They've overbuilt and now they want the City to raise taxes to save their sagging vacancy rates. The small hotels are doing fine.

And don't let anyone tell you this isn't a tax increase just because it's the hotel tax and not your property tax that's going up.

Proposition B represents $200 million in **public financing.**

Hotel tax revenues could be used for anything—schools, housing, infrastructure repairs, better MUNI service, removing asbestos from public buildings, bringing Laguna Honda up to seismic standards, AIDS research—**anything.**

Is a new underground convention center really the most desperate need in San Francisco? Is it even the most effective way to promote tourism?

Without Proposition B, Moscone Center will remain fully booked year-round. The new Marriott Hotel will build 100,000 square feet of meeting rooms and exhibit space on this very site without one dime of public money!

With Proposition B, tourism will increase by only 10,000 visitors per year. Surely there are better ways to spend $200 million than digging another hole in the ground.

And Proposition B will delay **for at least four years** the development of Yerba Buena Gardens. Haven't we waited long enough?

B is for boondoggle.

Vote NO.

Doug Engman
Sue Bierman
Calvin Welch
Dale Carlson
Sue Hestor
Jack Morrison
Alan Raznick
Dorice Murphy

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LEASE REVENUE FINANCING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONS TO THE GEORGE R. MOSCONE CENTER USING LEASE REVENUE BONDS AND A LEASE WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors acting pursuant to Charter Section 7.309 hereby submits to the electorate of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposition:

Shall the City construct additions to the George R. Moscone Convention Center which in the determination of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency prior to issuance of any lease revenue bonds hereunder does not materially affect the above ground elements of the existing Yerba Buena Gardens disposition and development agreement, and is substantially underground as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer, with above ground meeting rooms, on the blocks between Third and Fourth and Mission and Folsom Streets, to be financed by lease revenue bonds issued by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in a principal amount not to exceed $140,000,000 with the lease payments to be made from the General Fund which will be reimbursed from Hotel Room Tax revenues?

Voter Pamphlets for the Visually Impaired

Tape recordings (Talking Books) of the San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet and the California Voter Information Pamphlet are available from the San Francisco Public Library's branch for the blind at 3150 Sacramento Street. Copies of the tapes are free to voters who are visually impaired or otherwise unable to read printed material. Please inform any friends or family members who might benefit from this service.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Revenue Bond Procedures C

PROPOSITION C

Shall the City be authorized to issue new revenue bonds without a vote of the people, to pay off existing bonds at lower cost to the City?

YES 279 ➡
NO 280 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City may "refund" bonds by selling new bonds and using the money to pay off the old bonds. If the City pays less interest on the new bonds, it may save money. But with certain exceptions, the City may not issue bonds without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would amend the Charter to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds without a vote of the people, but only if the City would save money by doing so.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the people to vote on whether to sell new bonds to "refund" old bonds.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could result in a decrease in the cost of government, provided that interest rates would be the sole consideration for the refundings. The amount of anticipated savings, being dependent upon future legislative action, cannot be determined."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 48

SPECIAL NOTICE TO ABSENTEE VOTERS:

It is no longer legal to have someone else deliver your absentee ballot to the Registrar.

(Except for certain last-minute emergency ballots which are issued in specially-marked envelopes)

C Revenue Bond Procedures

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C would make it possible for the City to reduce bond interest costs when interest rates go down.

The City borrows money for some capital improvements by selling long-term revenue bonds. These bonds require payment of interest at rates established when bonds are originally sold. If interest rates go down **after** the revenue bonds have been sold, it is sometimes possible to save money by reissuing them at a lower interest rate. This is called "refunding". It is similar to refinancing a home mortgage as interest rates go down. The savings can be significant.

The Charter currently mandates that such refinancing go to a vote on the ballot. This can take more than a year. The delay can cost the City millions of dollars if the opportunity for refinancing is lost and interest rates rise again. Because interest rates change quickly, refinancing opportunities don't last long. In order to make use of such opportunities, the City must be able to move fast. A "Yes" vote on Proposition C will allow us to do so.

This past Spring, the City could, by taking advantage of low interest rates, have saved the 10 million dollars (over the life of the bonds) by refinancing Water Department bonds. Without Proposition C, we are unable to do so.

Proposition C will permit the Board of Supervisors to authorize the refunding of revenue bonds **ONLY** when it will save the City money. The Controller has certified that this proposition could reduce the cost of government.

We urge a "**Yes**" vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Passage of Proposition C will give the City the opportunity to save money by reducing interest costs.

Passage of Proposition C will allow the City to refinance long-term revenue bonds when interest rates go down, but only if the Board of Supervisors find that the refinancing will save interest expense.

A **Yes** vote on Proposition C will allow the City to move **quickly** to take advantage of changes in the interest rates. Currently, the City must go to the ballot to refinance long-term bonds. By the time that occurs, the interest rates might have risen again and the opportunity to save money is lost.

Passage of Proposition C would give the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors the ability to save money by refinancing bonds when interest rates go down.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:

Vote for Proposition C.

Stop wild BART spending.

Tom Spinosa, BART Board candidate

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION C

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

7.300 General Laws Applicable

The general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring and establishing the procedure for the creation of bonded indebtedness and authorizing and establishing the procedure for the issuance of bonds to refund indebtedness **of municipalities in force at the time any bonded indebtedness is** created or refunded by the city and county shall, except as otherwise provided in this charter, be applicable to the creation of bonded indebtedness and the issuance of refunding bonds by the city and county. Revenue bonds shall not be issued for any purpose unless the proposition to issue the revenue bonds has first been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition at a general or special election; provided, however, this requirement shall not apply:

(1) to bonds approved by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) to bonds issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Marks-Foran Residential Rehabilitation Act of 1973; or

(3) to bonds approved by a resolution of the board of supervisors adopted by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the board if the bonds are to finance a building or buildings, fixtures or equipment which are deemed by the board to be necessary to comply with an order of a duly constituted state or federal authority having jurisdiction over the subject matter; **or**

(4) to airport revenue bonds issued pursuant to section 7.306 of this charter~~;~~ **or**

(5) to revenue bonds which are issued as refunding bonds the sale of which results in a lower total scheduled principal and interest payments of the City and County of San Francisco. The board of supervisors by ordinance shall prescribe a procedure for the issuance of refunding bonds.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City use at least 12% of its open space funds for after school recreation programs, and at least 45% for the purchase and development of open space properties?

YES 282 ➡
NO 283 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City puts part of its taxes in a fund for buying open space property and improving property. At least 50% of the open space money must be spent on buying and developing new property, but that amount may be changed by the Board of Supervisors. Money from this fund may not be spent on after school recreation programs in the schools.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **D** would amend the Charter to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs. At least 45% must be spent on buying, developing and renovating open space property, with no fixed amount required for any one of these activities. The Board of Supervisors could not change these amounts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that at least 12% of the open space money be spent on after school recreation programs, and at least 45% be spent on buying, developing and renovating new open space property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require that open space money be spent on buying and developing new open space property, in an amount set by the Board of Supervisors, and that no open space money be spent on after school recreation programs.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, funds could be made available for certain recreation programs not currently funded."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 9–1 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

We can make no better investment in our future than to assure the safety and well-being of our children, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their skills and character.

Proposition D will restore a much-missed program that until 1978 had made a major contribution to the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

After school recreation programs at our neighborhood school sites gave many of us who grew up in San Francisco lifelong lessons in teamwork and self-confidence in sports and the performing arts. Children today need these wholesome opportunities more than ever.

Proposition D will take a small portion of money we already have set aside for open space acquisition, and apply it to providing supervised after school athletics, arts and crafts, music and performing arts programs for San Francisco children.

This is in the spirit of the charter amendment that more than a decade ago created the Open Space Acquisition Fund to increase recreation opportunities for San Francisco residents.

Proposition D won't cost any additional money. It will use money we already have.

Proposition D is a good idea that deserves a solid YES vote.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Throughout my term as Mayor, San Francisco was justifiably proud of the many opportunities we provided our children for wholesome, challenging recreation.

Boys and girls spent their time after school and on weekends at their neighborhood schools, in supervised athletic, arts and craft programs.

Since this program was eliminated 8 years ago, they have had little choice other than shopping malls, video game parlors and the streets.

Proposition D is a sensible solution which restores these much needed school site recreation programs at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Please join me in bringing back a sadly-missed part of what made San Francisco a very special place for families.

I respectfully ask for a YES on Proposition D.

George Christopher , Former Mayor of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

For thirty years, until the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978, San Francisco provided supervised after-school and weekend recreation programs serving thousands of children every day at their neighborhood school sites.

Severe budget constraints under Prop 13 forced the City to discontinue these programs.

Proposition D restores these supervised recreation programs AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Proposition D is a creative and fiscally-sound proposal which diverts a small annual percentage of San Francisco's open space acquisition and maintenance funds to pay for these recreation programs.

As land available for purchase becomes more scarce, Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by increasing wholesome recreational opportunities for San Francisco's children.

Proposition D is a good idea for many reasons:

- It doesn't cost any additional money, and puts money we already have to good use.
- It makes good use of school property, and may cut down on vandalism.
- It provides safe places for children to stay out of trouble.

For the children, for our neighborhoods and for the future, vote YES on Proposition D.

Diane Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Even after a decade of purchasing and renovating space and parks, the Open Space Acquisition Fund receives more money than can be spent.

It's time this money is spent on related, indisputably needed, and even more justifiable programs—keeping open our school recreational facilities after classes are over. School playgrounds and gyms should stay open after school, so our children can use them, as school kids used to do. This surplus open-space money should be spent for their after-school athletic activities on playgrounds and in gyms all over our City—from Hunter's Point and the Mission to Twin Peaks and the Sunset.

Proposition D is a principled, wise use of tax money already collected. I'm voting "yes" on D.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's Open Space Fund was established by the voters in 1974 to ensure that all neighborhoods share in the recreational opportunities that enhance the quality of life in our community.

The intention of that charter amendment was to purchase available open space land for use as parks and recreation areas, and also to maintain and improve existing parks and facilities.

Four years after the Open Space Fund charter amendment was enacted, San Francisco was forced by budget cutbacks to end the after school recreation programs that had been an integral part of neighborhood family life for three decades. The positive steps toward increasing recreation opportunities taken by the Open Space Fund were negated in many ways by the cancellation of after school recreation programs three years later.

Proposition D is a creative proposal that carries out the spirit of the Open Space Fund by restoring after school and weekend recreation programs at neighborhood school sites and playgrounds.

Proposition D would use only a small portion annually of the growing Open Space Fund, and would not interfere with the ongoing activities of the Fund.

Proposition D will once again provide San Francisco's children with safe, wholesome environments close to home—and at NO ADDITIONAL COST TO TAXPAYERS.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Thousands of single parents in San Francisco encounter great difficulty earning a living and raising a family. The uncertainty and insecurity of wondering where the children are and what they are doing while the parent is at work often is a source of great conflict to parents struggling to remain financially independent.

Re-establishing San Francisco's after school recreation program would permit thousands of single parents—mostly women—to succeed at work without the distraction of worrying every afternoon about their unsupervised children's well-being.

Proposition D will provide the margin of stability and security that many families need to survive. The money diverted from the Open Space Acquisition Fund under Proposition D will be a wise investment in enabling thousands of children to be involved in worthwhile, constructive activities.

Proposition D is a far-sighted, responsible solution to an urgent need.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Patricia A. Cutler, Vice President
San Francisco Women's Lawyers Alliance
Linda Post, Past President
National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Every day I see the sad consequences of children who lack safe places in which to pursue worthwhile activities.

Vandalism, graffiti, thefts, assaults, robberies, burglaries—many are the acts of idle young people seeking challenges, but lacking proper direction for their energies and abilities.

The after school recreation programs restored by Proposition D not only will help young people stay out of trouble, they will help imbue them with healthy attitudes about responsibility, cooperation and teamwork.

Our children need Proposition D. I strongly urge you to join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The children of San Francisco were dealt a serious blow when after school recreation programs were cancelled 8 years ago.

Working parents who had depended on safe, supervised recreation for their children suddenly found their family life in turmoil.

With the scarcity of quality childcare programs in San Francisco, many parents today must face the difficult choice of earning a living or staying home to look after their children.

Proposition D will restore the opportunities, the peace of mind and the convenience that San Francisco families enjoyed for thirty years.

For the children and for the community, vote YES on D.

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D, Writer/Economist
Rev. Howard S. Gloyd, Member, Civil Service Commission
Carlton B. Goodlett, Publisher, Reporter Publications

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Young people stay out of trouble when they have worthwhile, productive outlets for their energy.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have the guidance and supervision of adults who understand their needs and care about their well-being.

Young people stay out of trouble when they have opportunities, close to home, to associate with their peers in safe, wholesome environments.

The problems of graffiti, vandalism, drug abuse, robberies and burglaries are largely the work of young people with too much time on their hands and nowhere to pass it constructively.

Proposition D will provide thousands of San Francisco children and teenagers with opportunities to use their free time in developing their skills, instead of running the streets.

Proposition D will give thousands of parents the peace of mind that their children are safe in supervised recreation programs.

Proposition D will not cost taxpayers any additional money and it will help reduce the substantial costs associated with juvenile crime prevention and prosecution.

Proposition D deserves the support of all San Franciscans concerned with our children's future.

Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers Association
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Jim Ferguson, San Francisco Firefighters

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Most professional athletes began their careers in the schoolyards of the neighborhoods where they grew up.

For thousands of young people, athletic skills open new opportunities for higher education, professional success and lifelong better health.

Many of the sports world's greatest stars never would have attained their level of achievement if they had not had the facilities and the guidance to sharpen their skills as children and teenagers.

Proposition D will once again give San Francisco's children the chance to develop their talents, learn the meaning of teamwork and put their free time to good use.

San Francisco's children deserve every opportunity to grow and to excell. Our children need Proposition D.

Vida Blue
Al Rosen
Brad Duggan, Chairman, Physical Education Department, City College of S.F.
Mike Krukow
Wilbur Jiggets
David Roberts, Head Basketball Coach, City College of S.F.
Carl E. Frank
Nathaniel H. Lewis
Jerry Shilgi

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The elimination of after-school programs has left many of our young people with little to do once school lets out. September of last year when I proposed keeping school playgrounds open after school hours, I was concerned with the latch-key children who may fall into the criminal justice system because no one is supervising them, and those who may fall prey to abusive adults or peers. I thought too of the lonely child sitting in front of the television every afternoon without any social, cultural, intellectual or athletic activities or interests.

Proposition D will help those children. Vote YES on Proposition D.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children develop strong moral character and positive attitudes toward other people when they have opportunities to face meaningful challenges under the guidance of caring adults.

For three decades, thousands of San Francisco's children and teenagers each year participated in supervised after-school recreation programs. There, in safe, nurturing environments, they had fun while improving their skills in a wide variety of activities.

Since the cancellation of these programs, many children do little more than watch TV, congregate in video arcades, play in the streets and get mixed up in drinking and drugs.

Society should support and strengthen families at every opportunity. After school activities are desperately needed, and the creativity of Proposition D is an appropriate and effective response to this need.

Vote YES on D!

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner
Father Miles Riley
Rev. Dr. Norman E. Leach

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

"30 years of wholesome organized after school recreation activities on school playgrounds was cut short by Proposition 13. Our children and families suffered.

Proposition D restores these recreation programs NOT by new taxes, but by using a small portion of the money already accumulated to purchase open space and improve parks and recreation areas.

Proposition D gives San Franciscans a chance to make good use of our investment in school land for our children.

Proposition D will help strengthen our children's bodies, minds and characters. We strongly urge you to vote YES ON D."

The San Francisco Board of Education:

Myra Kopf, President
A. Richard Cerbatos, Vice President
Rosario Anaya
Libby Denebeim
JoAnne Miller
Benjamin Tom
Sodonia M. Wilson, Ph.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Working parents need safe, supervised environments for their children.

Until 8 years ago, when they fell victim to Proposition 13 cutbacks, after school recreation programs provided a vital service to thousands of families that did not have access to any other after school supervision for their children.

Proposition D will relieve many working parents of a serious conflict that interferes with their ability to earn a living.

Proposition D is good for San Francisco's children and families.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Jeff Greendorfer, San Francisco Labor Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The Open Space Acquisition Fund established by the voters more than a decade ago continues to grow while the supply of available open space declines in San Francisco.

Now is a good time to apply some of this money creatively, to fulfill the intentions which guided the establishment of the Fund.

Proposition D follows in the spirit of the open space movement by providing San Francisco children new opportunities to enjoy supervised outdoor activities.

Proposition D won't cost any additional tax money, since the after school recreation program will be funded from existing open space funds that have accrued for more than a decade.

Proposition D is an example of creative thinking to meet an urgent need, and this spirit deserves our wholehearted support.

Vote YES on D.

John Jacobs, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Kids and Open Space. **Not** a contradiction. We must devote resources to both. Proposition D will allow spending a very small percentage of our Open Space Fund money to operate after school programs for our children and youth until 1990.

Proposition D is a temporary solution while we work together to assure that by 1990 our Open Space Program is extended and a new source of money is found for services to children, youth and families.

Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D will bring back the neighborhood-based recreation programs that served our community well for more than 30 years.

Proposition D will once again involve parents, the schools, neighborhood groups and professional recreation instructors in creating safe, positive environments for San Francisco's children —close to where they live.

Proposition D presents a rare opportunity to restore a vital service, lost in a budget cut, at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on D!

Gordon J. Lau
Moon H. Yuen
William S. Leong

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

D Open Space; Recreation

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Many of San Francisco's children have nowhere to play after school that is safe and supervised.

Proposition D will restore a cost effective after school program that will direct the energies of our children in a positive, safe and healthy way. Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children with no additional cost to taxpayers.

ALICE B. TOKLAS LESBIAN/GAY DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Roberto Esteves, President
Greg Day
Richard Young
Dennis M. Collins
Patricia Arca
R. Hunter Morey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

One of the basic intentions of the open space movement in San Francisco has been to assure that people in every neighborhood have convenient access to recreational opportunities.

The Open Space Acquisition Fund was generated and has been replenished since 1975 by a specially-designated property tax.

The stability of the acquisition component of the program has provided us with the opportunity to undertake innovative recreational programs, especially where the need is greatest.

Restoring San Francisco's after school activities for our children is an urgent need that the Open Space Fund can fulfill to the benefit of all San Francisco residents in every neighborhood.

Open space funds are supposed to enhance the quality of life in San Francisco. Proposition D will fulfill that goal by providing thousands of children with safe, supervised places to develop their talents and abilities.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on D.

Bruce Raful, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Fred A. Rodriguez, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
James W. Haas
Jane Winslow, Member, Open Space Advisory Committee
Keith G. Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Children of all ages need constructive activities and safe environments.

For the past 8 years, San Francisco's children have lacked the supervised after school activities that gave their older brothers and sisters a chance to develop their skills in athletics, arts and crafts and music.

Proposition D will return after school programs to our neighborhoods, to give our children alternatives to playing in the streets or sitting home watching TV.

Bring back the community-based programs that once again will enrich our children's lives.

Vote YES on D!

Jim Gonzalez
Rosemarie Fernandez, YWCA President
Ralph Hurtado
Commissioner Carlota T. del Portillo
Elizabeth Aguilar Tardi
Commissioner Fred A. Rodriguez
Commissioner Joan Zamora Mourton
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert E. Gonzalez, former member Board of Supervisors
Sgt. Art Tapia

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Common sense and personal experience tell us that children grow brighter and stronger if they have constructive outlets for their boundless energy and curiosity.

Until 1978, San Francisco provided its children with opportunities after school and on weekends to challenge and improve their minds and bodies in supervised recreation programs located at neighborhood schools.

Because of severe Prop 13 budget cutbacks, these programs serving thousands of San Francisco children were discontinued. Many families, particularly those headed by single parents and those with two working parents, suffer every day the anxiety of worrying about their children's safety after school.

Proposition D will bring back the opportunities many of us enjoyed as children—and it won't cost any additional money.

Proposition D will involve San Francisco's schools, parents and recreation and community resources as partners in helping our children grow up in safe, stimulating and nurturing environments.

Proposition D is a creative, workable solution to a problem that has gotten worse every year since 1978.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Jill Wynns, President, San Francisco Parents' Lobby
John B. Molinari
Louise K. Molinari
William Coblentz
Neil D. Eisenberg, General Counsel, Northern California Democratic Party
James E. O'Connor
Mary M. O'Connor
Darrell J. Salomon
E. Porcher Hester

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Open Space; Recreation D

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's parents and children need our help! Today in many families both parents work full time and a large and growing number of our children live in single parent families. Our children and youth need supervised after school recreation as a safe and cost effective alternative to recreation on our city's streets.

Proposition D will provide a safe supervised use of open space for our children.

Vote Yes on Prop D.

Greg Day, Co-chair
Campaign To Re-open The Playgrounds After School

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D offers San Franciscans an opportunity that is too good to pass up.

At no additional cost to taxpayers, Proposition D restores programs that for three decades had been the central focus of family life in our neighborhoods.

Generations of San Francisco children learned the spirit of cooperation, developed strong bodies and explored their talents as artists and performers in after-school recreation programs.

Since these programs were discontinued 8 years ago, we have lacked attractive, constructive alternatives to the idle mischief in which children and teenagers too often involve themselves.

Proposition D is right for the times and right for our City.

Join us in voting YES on D!

Diane Derre Blackman, President, Junior League of San Francisco
Lisa Hawley, Vice-President, Junior League of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

San Francisco has suffered without the after school recreation programs that meant so much to growing children. Proposition D gives us a welcome chance to bring back a vital service thousands of families counted on in the past.

San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Submitted on behalf of the San Francisco Democratic Central Committee by Greg Day, a member of the Committee.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The so-called Open Space Amendment is a fraud. It should be defeated so that next year a true Open Space proposal can be submitted to the voters.

As a past president of the Board of Education, I am aware and supportive of young people's recreational needs. I do not, however, support using open space funds for this purpose. You cannot solve one problem by creating another!

In reality this amendment will not require the acquisition of any new open space . . . None AT ALL! It simply requires that 45% go to renovation and acquisition. Think of it, no new open space—NONE AT ALL! This amendment is a fraud, for it uses the name open space while denying its reality.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Bill Maher, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

San Francisco's neighborhoods urge the funding of after school programs for the city's children, but not at the expense of desperately needed open space acquisition and renovation.

In 1974, the voters adopted Proposition J, dedicated to funding open space acquisition and renovation. Over the years, the fund has been used to make up part of our open space deficiency. The job is not completed, however. A recent draft open space plan prepared by the City's planners shows many neighborhoods deficient in open space.

The neighborhoods have also been fighting for years to restore the after-school recreation programs at our parks and playgrounds. Now the politicians are telling you that you may have after school programs only at the expense of our parks.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION D. Preserve our open space fund in order that the park and recreation needs of the City's expanding population can be met.

COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before June, 1961 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a proportionate amount?

YES 285 ➡
NO 286 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years they have worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the Charter to give an additional $50 each month to City workers who retired before June of 1961. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 a month more in pension payments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to remain as they are now.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $1.2 to $1.4 million each year from 1987 through 2000."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

NEXT TIME YOU MOVE . . .
DON'T LEAVE YOUR VOTE BEHIND!

You must re-register to vote whenever you move.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 97

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Retirement Allowance E

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As voters, you have a chance to rectify a problem which has caused financial strain and hardship for over 10,000 retired City employees.

Currently, the City's pension system allows only a 2% annual increase in the benefits given to retired miscellaneous City employees. With inflation in double digits a few years ago and current salary adjustments for active employees at 6%, retired miscellaneous employees are falling further and further behind the real costs of living. Employees who retired in 1961 today receive an average pension of $299, and they are not covered by Social Security. This ballot measure will give these retirees $2 a month more for every year of service up to a maximum of $50 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition E.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The retired employees of the City and County of San Francisco are asking the people of San Francisco to approve a $50 per month maximum cost-of-living adjustment in the retirement allowance of retired employees for those who have retired before July 2, 1985 **and** have been retired for at least 25 years. The adjustment is reduced proportionately for those with fewer years of retirement.

The Retirement System records show that there are 710 retirees who have been retired 25 years or more. These retirees receive an average monthly retirement allowance of only $299 per month and are not covered by Social Security.

We all know the adverse effects of rampant inflation—but for the elderly retiree living on a fixed income, it is even more brutal. Their standard of living has decreased each year with little opportunity to increase their income.

This charter amendment provides for a fair adjustment in the retirement allowances for these retirees and has been approved unanimously by the Board of Supervisors.

Vote yes on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Official records of the city's Retirement System clearly support the need for a cost-of-living adjustment in the pensions of the older retired city workers. Several thousand now receive retirement allowances below poverty level, approximately 50% of whom are women, and they have little opportunity for employment to supplement fixed retirement income. Certainly, a benefit of $2.00 per month for each year of retirement to a maximum of $50 monthly is not a high cost for a little more security for those who retired in the 60s and 70s.

We strongly recommend a YES vote on Proposition "E"

San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
Federation of Retired Union Members San Francisco Labor Council. AFL-CIO
S.F. City Employees Credit Union
Thomas Scanlon, former City Treasurer
John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors
Civil Service Per Diem Men's Assoc.
Laborers International Union #261
Bldg. Material & Const. Teamsters #216
Wendy Nelder
Carpenters Local Union #22
Retail Clerks Employees Union 410R
Plasterer's & Shophand's Local #66
Richard D. Hongisto
Nancy G. Walker
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers #921
Office & Professional Employees #3
Willie B. Kennedy
Louise Renne
Harry G. Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Piledrivers Local #34
Painters Local #4
S.F. Fire Fighters Local #798
United Telegraph Workers Local 34
S.F. Police Officers' Assoc.
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., Retired State Assemblyman
Sprinkler Fitters #483
S.F. Theatrical Federation
Int'l. Molders & Allied Workers Local 164
Doris Ward
Retired Firemen & Widows Ass'n. of the S.F. Fire dept.
Jack Morrison
Teamsters & Auto Truck Local #70
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Ass'n.
Joseph Tinney
Teamsters Retiree Club Local 85
Revels Cayton
Hod Carriers Local 36
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7
No. California Jt. Council of Service Employees No. 2
Sheet Metal Union Local #104
Hon. Sala Burton, Rep. in Congress
Bill Maher
S.F. Federation of Teachers AFT 61
Bay Area Typographical Union Local #21
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #6
Transport Workers Union of America, Local 250A-AFL-CIO
Mike Garza
Terence Faulkner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

E Retirement Allowance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a simple, just proposal to increase the retirement allowances for elderly retired City employees. Please support it.

Currently, the maximum pension for City retirees is $299 per month. Both you and I know how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make ends meet for less than $300 per month. Unlike other public-sector pensioners, our City retirees aren't provided periodic cost-of-living increases in their pensions. That's not right.

For City workers who retired before 1961, Proposition E would increase pensions by $50 per month. For workers who retired after 1961, the monthly increase would be even less, depending on the length of their retirement. Older retired public servants will be given a pension increase of more than younger retired city employees. That's the way it should be in a society which cares about its elders. That's why I co-authored this Charter amendment with Supervisor Kennedy.

VOTE YES ON E. It's humane, and it's only fair.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

San Francisco's retired employees worked hard to give us this beautiful city. Because of inflation and the passage of time, they now have little money to enjoy it.

Proposition E asks very little. $50 per month means only $1.50 more a day for food, clothes and rent. But it can be a significant weapon against ill health due to chill or malnutrition. Help those who helped us. Vote YES on Proposition E.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorses and supports Proposition "E" on the November, 1986 ballot.

As members of the Retirement Board we are required to administer retirement benefits for all active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the grinding effect of inflationary pressures on those persons who were retired many years ago; these persons are the ones who are having a most difficult time handling the constant rise in the costs of everyday living.

This ballot amendment is aimed directly toward providing some small relief for those who have been retired the longest. It gives a small $2.00 per month improvement in benefits for each year since date of retirement. Those retired in the recent past will receive the least increase per month, while those 710 retirees and their beneficiaries who have been retired 25 years or more will receive the $50.00 per month maximum increase allowed. This is an especially worthwhile amendment since it gives the greatest benefit to those who need it the most.

As a matter of fairness and justice in retirement benefits, the Retirement Board urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "E".

Retirement Board of the City and County of San Francisco

Peter D. Ashe, President
Paul F. Denning, Vice President
Samuel W. Walker, Commissioner
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner
Raymond Weisberg, M.D., Commissioner
Bonnie K. Gibson, Commissioner
John L. Molinari, President Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

PROPOSITION E is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of "miscellaneous" city employees who retired years ago on pensions which have proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term "miscellaneous" applies to persons in various city job classifications.

PROPOSITION E provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2 minimum.

Official Retirement System records show that the average monthly allowance is $659 for "miscellaneous" retirees. While city employed, these workers paid a portion of their salaries to a pension fund in the belief they were establishing an adequate fund for retirement years. Many retirees in the advanced age group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefit is very short (some are 75 to 95 years of age), the cost to the city will reduce rapidly. Since **PROPOSITION E** applies only to the presently retired, the total cost will be funded in 15 years.

PROPOSITION E is endorsed by civic groups, business and labor organizations and prominent citizens. In fairness, join them in voting **YES** on November 4th. THANK YOU. Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Tom McDonough, President
Jaykee Ford, Legislative Comm. Chrm.
John Simpson, Ret. Comm. Chrm.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall the City be authorized to participate with other public agencies in a system of "reciprocal retirement benefits" for their workers under state law?

YES 287
NO 288

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City workers who have previously worked for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent in that job. City employees who later go to work for another public agency may lose retirement benefits for time spent working for the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the Charter to allow San Francisco workers to receive "reciprocal pension benefits" under state law. City workers who came from other public agencies would receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each. City workers who later go to work for another public agency would also receive retirement benefits from each employer for time spent working for each.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow City workers to receive "reciprocal retirement benefits."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it being permissive, would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, there will be a cost increase, the amount of which cannot be determined but could be substantial."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 61

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7:00 A.M. TO 8:00 P.M.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

F Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

We put this proposition on the ballot because we believe it is a good government measure that benefits taxpayers, managers, and employees. The purpose of our City government is to serve the needs of the people who live, work and visit here. As services are made available by the efforts of City personnel, the quality of the services is only as good as the people who serve. Often people having years of distinguished service with the state or other government entities are unable to accept City employment because they must first give up their pension/retirement benefits already earned. With this Charter amendment, the City retirement board could allow those people to remain under their original retirement plan. To do anything else is to continue the City's inability to attract persons of experience and skill. It is unfair to demand persons of experience and skill, and their families, to give up their previously earned pension rights when accepting City employment.

Most counties in California already have these pension reciprocity provisions. Costs associated with this measure, if any, are estimated to be slight and are far outweighed by the administrative advantages. In fact, the budget analyst notes that in certain circumstances there may be cost savings.

Join us in voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F.

San Francisco is at a disadvantage when competing for experienced municipal government workers. State employees and a great many local government employees either belong to the same pension system, Public Employees Retirement System, or to systems which offer reciprocal benefits.

San Francisco has always maintained its own pension system and does not count the time spent in the employment of other government jursidictions toward an employee's pension. Because of this, many people who might otherwise be interested in City employment look elsewhere. The result is a smaller pool of talented applicants from which to fill City jobs.

You, the voters, can help change that by voting YES on Proposition F. Under this proposition, the Board of Supervisors will be able to enter into agreements with other pension plans so that employees moving to or from San Francisco will not lose all of the retirement benefits they have accrued. There would be no cost to taxpayers.

Vote YES on Proposition F

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

The San Francisco Retirement Board recommends to the voters of San Francisco that Proposition F be adopted. By enabling the establishment of reciprocity between our own system and most of the public employee retirement systems in California, the passage of **Proposition F will improve** the independent viability of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSTION F.

Peter D. Ashe, President
San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WE SUPPORT the proposed Charter amendment that would enable the Board of Supervisors to contract with the Public Employees' Retirement System of California to provide reciprocity with the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System.

Vote **YES** on Proposition **F**.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Willie L. Brown Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Milton Marks, Member of the Senate
Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Ernest C. Ayala, Community College Board
Julie Tang, Community College Board
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Firefighters Local #798
San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs' Association
San Francisco Municipal Attorneys' Association
Registered Nurses, United Public Employees' Local #790
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local #21
San Francisco Airport Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Probation Officers' Association
San Francisco District Attorney Investigators' Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Reciprocal Retirement Benefits

F

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I proposed placing proposition F on the ballot because it is a good government measure. Retirement system reciprocity enables employees to move from one retirement system to another without losing earned pension benefits. San Francisco is the only county in California which is not linked to the reciprocal network headed by the California Public Employees' Retirement System. Because we do not participate in this network, our employees, who have prior service in other jurisdictions, are deprived of a benefit which is available to about 90% of the public employees in California. For this reason, it is very difficult to recruit highly trained and experienced applicants to fill vacancies in sensitive positions throughout City service. The Department of Public Health has extreme problems in this regard.

I believe that passage and implementation of Proposition F will significantly increase our ability to attract qualified City employees, and that better service to all of the people who live and work in San Francisco will result.

The thirty year history of retirement system reciprocity in California indicates that its long term cost is minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.500-1 Reciprocal Pension Benefits with Other Public Pension Plans.

Subject to the provisions of Section 8.500, the board of supervisors shall have the power to enact ordinances to establish reciprocal agreements with the Public Employees' Retirement System and other public agencies maintaining independent retirement systems for the purpose of extending reciprocal benefits to members of such systems as provided by state law. The board of supervisors and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such agreements.

Hear the Candidates and Issues

CAMPAIGN COUNTDOWN

KPOO-FM 89.5

Saturday, November 1, 1986

12 Noon	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, Community College Board, BART Board, State Propositions
2:00	Proposition A—Fire Protection Bonds
2:10	Proposition B—Moscone Center Expansion
2:30	Proposition C—Bond Refinancing
2:35	Proposition D—Playground Funding
2:50	Proposition E—Retirement Pay
2:55	Proposition F—Retirement Benefits
3:00	Proposition G—Union-Time Pensions
3:05	Proposition H—Pay Equity
3:20	Proposition I, J—Police/Fire Pay & Age Limits
3:30	Proposition K—Art Curator
3:35	Proposition M—Planning Issues
3:50	Proposition N—Oil Facilities

G Employee Reps. Retirement

PROPOSITION G

Shall the City allow union representatives to receive retirement benefits for time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers?

YES 290 ➡
NO 291 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco provides a pension system for City workers. Workers gain pension benefits based upon their salary at the time of retirement, and the number of years they have worked for the City. The City and the workers both make payments to the retirement fund. Workers get no pension credit for time spent as labor representatives for City workers.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would amend the Charter to allow labor representatives to receive retirement credit for the time they spend on leave from City service to represent City workers. The labor organization would pay all of the City's share of the pension payments during this time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives for the time they spend on leave from City service representing City workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to give retirement credit to labor representatives only for the time they spend in City service and not for the time they spend representing City workers.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY:

It is not necessary to wait for an official application form from the Registrar; simply write your request on a postcard.

Employee Reps. Retirement G

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

State law emphasizes the right of City employees to join recognized organizations to afford them a voice in the delivery of City services. State law promotes full communication between the City and its employees to strengthen the delivery of City services. To that end employees are authorized to elect a representative for their bargaining unit. In the case of large units, serving as a representative is a full-time job with their salary paid by the union. Hence, such an employee representative must leave his or her City job to serve as the representative.

As it is now, City employees elected by their co-workers to serve full-time as the employee representative must forego their pension benefits while serving as a representative. Often qualified employees with families who might be able to serve as effective employee representatives must forego the opportunity because they cannot afford to relinquish their pension benefits. Anything that detracts from the ability of employees to select their most qualified representative undermines the mutual objectives of the City and its employees that full and effective communications between management and workers be fostered.

This measure would allow employee representatives to remain in the pension system provided their union pays the full costs of their participation during the time they are serving as employee representatives.

Harmony is an essential part of making city government work. Proposition G means better services for the people of San Francisco AT NO EXTRA COST TO THE TAXPAYER.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Under our current system, if a Transport Workers Union official represents workers for many years, he or she loses those years of credit toward retirement benefits. It would be possible for a very effective union representative to reach retirement age without any right to retirement benefits, even after many years of service to the City as well as to the union's members.

Fairness demands that retirement contributions from private sources on behalf of employee representatives be allowed during their terms of service.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

When a Muni operator is granted a leave of absence from the City for the purpose of serving as an employee representative, he or she serves in the best interests of the MUNI, the City, and the riding public of San Francisco. A safe and efficient transit system is a VITAL public service to the citizens of San Francisco. It plays a major role in the daily function of our great City. This is made possible from the dedication, commitment, and concern of those who represent the Muni operators.

Without this Charter Amendment, there is no legal authority to permit these representatives to continue and maintain their membership in the City's Retirement System. This Charter Amendment would require the employee organization and the employee representatives to contribute the "normal amount" that would have been contributed by the City and the employees had they not been on leave of absence.

THERE IS NO COST TO THE CITY. IT IS A FAIR AMENDMENT. We urge you to join us and VOTE YES on this FAIR amendment.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA

Lawrence Martin
Samuel Walker
Ray Antonio
John Hepburn
William Jung
Allie Thomas, Jr.
Bobbie Brown
Donray Stevens
Robert McCollins
Wilson Mills
Charles Flintroy
Herbert Goodspeed
Alvin Sweetwyne

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Unofficial Matter:

About the Ballot Arguments

Where do ballot arguments come from?
Who writes them?
Who pays for them?
Why are there so many of them?

Ballot arguments that appear in this pamphlet are filed with the Registrar 71 days before the election. With some exceptions, they are paid for by the people who sign them or by the campaigns supporting or opposing the propositions.

The Registrar charges $50 plus $1.50 per word for each ballot argument; the typical 200-word argument costs $350, payable in advance.

The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors each get one free argument on each proposition but individual Supervisors must pay.

Any voter or association of citizens may submit an argument and there is no limit on the number of arguments that can be submited. A record was set in 1986 when 50 arguments were submitted for and against a single measure!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

PROPOSITION H

Shall the City be authorized to grant wage increases to City workers in jobs disproportionately occupied by minorities and women, according to an annual pay equity survey?

YES 293 ➡
NO 294 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for its employees by surveying Northern California cities and counties to find out the prevailing rate of pay for various jobs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition **H** would amend the Charter to require the civil service commission to conduct an annual pay equity survey. It would compare pay rates for City jobs held primarily by women and minorities with pay rates for other City jobs. Based upon the survey results, the City could give pay increases to workers in particular jobs. The Mayor could veto any increase.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City, after conducting a pay equity survey, to increase the regular rates of pay for City workers in jobs held primarily by women and minorities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set rates of pay for City workers based upon the prevailing rates of pay for the same jobs in Northern California cities and counties.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual pay equity study, cannot be determined, but could be substantial."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 98

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will permit the City to consider the principal of pay equity when fixing employee salaries.

It is well documented that certain types of jobs held primarily by women and minorities pay far less than those traditionally held by men. The current charter does not permit the City to adjust salaries to correct these pay inequities.

Your Yes vote on Proposition H will allow the City, in a fiscally prudent way, to adjust salaries of certain job classifications subject to:

1) An impartial survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

2) Board of Supervisors action to adjust salaries not to exceed the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission.

3) Veto of any salary adjustments the Mayor determines the City cannot afford.

Proposition H is a fair and reasonable method gradually to phase-in pay equity adjustments for deserving women and minority employees without increasing taxes. Its built-in safeguards insure that salaries are fair for both the employee and the taxpayer.

Please join me in voting Yes on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

One of the most complex issues the Board of Supervisors has faced for many years has been pay equity.

Correcting decades of discriminatory wage and salary practices in City employment has been a high priority, but devising the proper formula and implementing a fiscally-responsible program have presented formidable obstacles.

Proposition H at last provides a sensible, workable solution, with strict cost controls.

Proposition H establishes a mechanism and a method for the Civil Service Commission to analyze and compare city jobs annually on an objective, scientific basis to determine their relative "worth".

Proposition H then sets out an orderly procedure to phase in pay adjustments gradually, to correct the most severe imbalances.

Proposition H includes safeguards to ensure that wage and salary increases are strictly limited.

The Board of Supervisors cannot increase City worker's pay above the level set by the Civil Service Commission's annual study of City job classifications.

And the Mayor retains the power to veto any adjustment determined to be excessive.

After many years of conflict and controversy, Proposition H has emerged as a practical first step toward solving a fundamental issue of justice, in a way that keeps costs under control.

Proposition H is the product of many years of careful thought and conscientious negotiations. Please join us in supporting Proposition H.

Vote yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Various proposals have emerged in the past to deal with the issues of "comparable worth" and "pay equity." I have refused to support any of them because they favored selected City employees and were capricious and full of gimmicks, as well as fiscally extravagant.

Proposition H is different. It's a reasonable, moderate proposal gradually to correct imbalances in the way some female City employees are paid. Proposition H doesn't contain phony "meal allowances" or arbitrary class distinctions. It says that the Civil Service Commission will scrutinize jobs which appear underpaid because they were traditionally filled by women or minorities, then recommend such salary increases as the Commission believes merited because the job pay scale was traditionally based on women and minorities filling the job. Librarians, traditionally women, are examples of well trained and educated public servants whose pay is less than employees in jobs requiring less education and training.

The Board of Supervisors would next accept or reject any or all of such recommended increases. The Mayor could thereafter veto any such pay increases singly or in their entirety, something she can't do now. This system contains no less than three checks and balances; past demands lacked any check or balance.

Let's try to correct some historical inequities. Vote "Yes" on H.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H provides a positive process for ending the great disparities in salaries paid to women and minorities. Vote yes to open the door for equitable pay for all city employees.

Greg Day, Candidate, Board of Education

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical solution to a complicated problem.

Proposition H requires the Civil Service Commission to conduct an objective, scientific annual study of city job classifications, comparing them on the basis of skills and training they require.

After careful analysis, each job will be given a precise ranking in terms of its worth. Comparisons will be made between relative worth and relative salaries, and those jobs with the largest disparities will have their pay scales adjusted first.

The process will move ahead gradually, and year by year long-standing pay inequities will be corrected.

There will be no sudden explosion in the cost of employees' salaries and wages. Politics will not play a role in setting wages. The Board of Supervisors will not be allowed to raise city employees' pay above the limit set by the annual study. The Mayor will have the power to veto any pay increases the City cannot afford.

In short, Proposition H is fair, sensible and affordable.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

John L. Molinari, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H answers the concerns that many of us had about previous efforts to enact "comparable worth" policies.

Proposition H restricts the influence of politics in setting city employees' salaries and places firm limits on the total amount of money that can be applied to correcting pay inequities.

Proposition H gives the Mayor final veto power over any salary adjustments that might be too costly.

Proposition H uses money that already has been set aside and does not involve any new taxes or new budget appropriations.

Proposition H makes sense for San Francisco. That's why so many San Franciscans concerned about fiscal responsibility urge you to vote YES on H.

Supervisor *Louise Renne*, Chair, Finance Committee
Bruce Lilienthal, President, SF Council of District Merchants
Christopher Martin, President
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Peter Hanson, Esq.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

For the first time ever, public officials agree on a course of action to pay city employees a fair wage for the work they perform.

The basic American principle that people whose jobs are equally demanding should receive the same pay has been violated by outmoded attitudes based on sex and race.

Women traditionally have been paid less than men, and whole categories of jobs held predominately by women pay less than similar jobs held by men. Women with more education, more training, and more responsibilities consistently are paid less than men who perform equal or less demanding tasks.

Similarly, jobs held in higher percentages by minority men pay less than comparable jobs held in higher percentages by non-minority men.

Proposition H is the first major effort to gradually establish an equitable relationship between the value of city jobs and the wages they are paid.

In the past, attempts to rectify this situation have been criticized as too complicated or too expensive.

Proposition H's moderate approach has won the support of many community leaders who have opposed previous proposals to enact pay equity legislation.

Proposition H clearly is an idea whose time has come.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Nancy Walker, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a practical, affordable way to correct unfair pay differences between jobs primarily held by women and minorities and jobs held by men.

Proposition H establishes a workable method for objectively analyzing the relative "worth" of city jobs.

Proposition H sets up a gradual timetable for phasing in wage adjustments to correct the most severe inequities.

Proposition H is a fiscally-responsible plan that tightly controls any costs involved in adjusting wages.

Proposition H is the first widely-supported proposal to turn years of talk and good intentions about fair pay into meaningful action.

Vote YES on H.

Sala Burton, Member of Congress
Milton Marks, State Senator
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Art Agnos, Assembly Member
Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity H

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

After years of studies, surveys, discussions, negotiations and cost analyses, we finally have a workable proposal to resolve the long-standing pay equity issue.

For the first time ever, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and city employees agree on a course of action to gradually adjust employees' salaries to conform to an objective analysis of what each job is worth.

The goal of Proposition H is to correct the unfair disparity in salaries paid to women and minorities as compared to nonminority men in jobs requiring equivalent qualifications.

Proposition H proceeds at a gradual pace and under strict cost controls. Proposition H is sensible and fair, and long overdue.

Please join us in voting YES on H.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Dr. Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Board
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
John Burton, Former Congressman
Sue Bierman, Commissioner
Agar Jaicks
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Walter Johnson, Executive Secretary, SF Labor Council
Peter Mezey
Carol Mezey
Charlie Starbuck
Linda Post

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Women and minority males for decades were systematically excluded from certain jobs held predominately by men. Although affirmative action efforts have made some progress toward opening access to better-paying jobs, the vast majority of women and minority men remain in job classifications at the lower end of the pay scale.

Many of these lower-paid jobs, by any objective evaluation, require as much education, training and skills and involve as many responsibilities as higher-paid jobs traditionally held by nonminority men.

Proposition H will gradually phase in pay adjustments, to establish a fair and equitable relationship between the value of an employee's work and the pay he or she receives.

Proposition H will boost the morale and productivity of city employees by paying them a fair wage for their work, and all San Francisco will benefit.

Action on pay equity is long overdue, and Proposition H is the right first step.

Join us in voting YES on H!

Doris M. Ward, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Louis Hop Lee, Commissioner
Rosario Anaya, Member, Board of Education
Julie Tang, Member, Community College Board
Richard Cerbatos, Member, Board of Education
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, Member, Community College Board
Yori Wada, Member, California Board of Regents
Jonnie Johnson, President, Black Leadership Forum
Agnes Chan
Al Borvice
Sandy Ouye Mori

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Members of the Board of Supervisors have known for many years that city employees' salaries do not accurately reflect the relative value of the work performed.

Jobs traditionally and predominately held by men pay more than those held by women and minorities, regardless of the qualifications required to perform the jobs.

All efforts in the past to correct this irrational and unfair situation fell short because of questions about the costs of these salary adjustments, and fears about excessive demands by city employees.

Proposition H addresses these concerns. Proposition H has built-in safeguards to control costs. Proposition H gives the Mayor the authority to veto any pay increases considered to be excessive.

Proposition H is the kind of sensible solution we would have voted for if it had come up while we were members of the Board of Supervisors.

Last year the City began accruing money in a Pay Equity Fund to pay for a gradual phase-in of wage adjustments over several years.

The machinery at last has been set up for a reasonable and fiscally responsible resolution to a longstanding problem. At last the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and the city employees agree on a common plan.

Let's not pass up this opportunity to bring common sense and fairness to city employees' salaries.

Vote YES on H.

Former Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:
Don Horanzy
Bob Gonzales
Jack Morrison
Terry Francois
Gordon Lau

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

H Prevailing Wages & Pay Equity

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Eight years ago, a pioneering study comparing the wages of male and female city workers showed that jobs traditionally held by women paid 74% less than jobs traditionally held by men.

Clerk-typist position, a classification more than 90% female, paid 80% less than predominately male jobs with comparable requirements.

The disparity in wages between women and men is well-documented, and the injustice has been widely recognized for many years. The difficult challenge has been to find a workable, affordable method to correct these pay inequities.

The most realistic approach to remedy the situation is to objectively assess the value to the city of the work done in jobs held predominately by women and minorities compared to jobs held primarily by non-minority men; compare the present salaries with the intrinsic value of the job; and correct any pay inequities discovered in female and minority dominated classes by increasing their salaries to the level of male dominated jobs of similar value.

For years the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have expressed their commitment to this approach.

At last, Proposition H offers a way to gradually phase in salary adjustments to correct sex and race based pay inequities in the San Francisco city workforce.

Proposition H is the right step at the right time.

Vote YES on H!

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, President, Civil Service Commission
Isabel Huie, President, Commission on the Status of Women
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Joan San Jule, Commissioner
Catherine Dodd, Past President, SF National Organization for Women
Eleanor Minsky, President, SF National Women's Political Caucus
Judy Hirshberg, Chair, California NWPC
Linda Post, Former Chair, SF Democratic Party
Patsy Ishiyama
Margel Kaufman, Former President, Parents' Lobby
Louise Ogden, Vice Chair, California NWPC
Beth Parker, SF Women Lawyers' Alliance
Del Martin
Phyllis Lyon, Commissioner
Pam Duffy, Esq
SF Women in Trades
Bernice Becker, SF Chapter, Older Women's League
Judith Kurtz, Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates*

*For identification purposes only

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Achieving pay equity is long overdue. Permitting pay equity is a milestone every voter should fully support. This is the first of a series of commitments to compensate employees in proportion to services provided. We can overturn gender and racial inequities that obstruct this goal.

San Francisco benefits from the experiences of about 100 California cities that have instituted pay equity, including Los Angeles, San Jose, and Pismo Beach. The city can make a reliable and rapid study. A $30 million fund has been set aside for salary increases for underpaid women and minorities.

Study results have been striking. In San Francisco those who care for our animals are paid over 40% more than those who care for our children. Truck drivers make more than librarians and almost $7,000 more than nurses!

Low pay results in lower quality government. Pay equity means better government services. Morale should improve, turnover should decrease, and better workers would be attracted. Vote for H, and a more just government.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Yes on Proposition H.

End Bart's long-standing record of having few minority or female employees in management positions.

San Franciscans For Bart Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a special interest city salary increase without regard to merit or job performance. It over-rides the tested formula making salaries comparable with those of other local governments. It opens salary provisions in the City Charter to challenge since Proposition H reads. . ."notwithstanding. . .any provision of any other section of this charter. . ."

This is the latest in a long line of arguments whose sole purpose is to justify ever-rising salary boosts for city employees. Next year will we vote on increases for employees living in the city sectors of high housing costs? The year after, will we vote on hardship raises for employees who commute because of increased gas prices?

What is a Minority?

Proposition H does not define a minority. One assumes from its language that only white males are a majority. If sexual preference is a minority category, how will a survey be taken without an invasion of privacy?

Proposition H uses our sense of fair play to enact vague rules designed to side-step the fair rules now in place.

Vote No on Proposition H.

John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay



PROPOSITION I

Shall the City be authorized to adjust police and fire department pay rates after adoption of the annual salary survey to include rates adopted in other cities after that date?

YES 296 ➡
NO 297 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City sets wages for police officers and firefighters each year during the annual salary review. The basic rates of pay are decided by averaging the annual pay of similar workers in the largest California cities. This survey must be completed by August 1, and may not be amended after August 25. The rates of pay then go into effect beginning on July 1, the following year. If one of the cities in the survey is bargaining with its police officers or firefighters, but does not grant them a pay raise until after August 25, that increase is not counted by the City in setting the rate of pay for San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would amend the Charter to allow the City to change the annual salary ordinance for police officers and firefighters at any time up to June 30 of the following year. The change would only be allowed to include a pay increase for police officers or firefighters in the surveyed cities in setting the rates of pay in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters at any time before July 1 in order to include pay raises granted in all surveyed cities.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to set wages for police officers and firefighters based upon the average wages in the surveyed cities as of August 25 of the previous year.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending an annual survey, cannot be determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 4 the Board of Supervisors voted 8–0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 98

APPLY FOR YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT EARLY

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The San Francisco Charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities. Unfortunately this does not always happen because of a minor flaw in our Charter.

The San Francisco Charter requires that police officer's and firefighter's salaries be based upon the average police and fire salaries paid in cities with a population of more than 350,000. Each year the Civil Service Commission conducts a survey of these salaries and sends it to the Board of Supervisors by August 1. The Board of Supervisors must adopt the result of that survey no later than August 25. Police officers and firefighters are then paid according to the new rate retroactive to July 1.

This formula doesn't always work because some of the cities we survey negotiate their police and fire wages and do not set new wages until after August 25. This strict August 25 cut-off date means that rates of pay in these jurisdictions are not reflected in our police officer's and firefighter's wages until the following year.

This is basically unfair. Our charter is designed to pay our police officers and firefighters the average rate paid in other large cities—yet in practice this does not always occur.

This amendment would correct this minor flaw by allowing for more flexibility in the deadline so that all cities have a chance to be surveyed.

We urge you to adopt this charter amendment that insures fair treatment of our police officers and firefighters.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

In 1975, San Francisco voters approved a Charter Amendment which set police and firefighter salaries equal to the average paid by major California cities. However, this formula has not produced complete wage data.

The reason? At least one of the other cities has failed to set its police and firefighters' wages in time for San Francisco's Charter-mandated August 25 wage-setting deadline.

The result? The averaging formula has not included all the wage data. Therefore, police and firefighters have not received the full salary to which they are entitled under the charter. For example, Los Angeles failed to set their 1985 salaries in time, costing our police officers and firefighters hundreds of dollars in salary they would otherwise be entitled.

Your "Yes" vote on Proposition I will correct this flaw. It will **not** change our current method of fixing police and firefighter salaries. Proposition I merely will allow the use of wage rates of a city that is late in fixing its own police/fire salaries.

Unlike previous proposals, Proposition I protects the taxpayers by limiting the impact of any late wage adjustments to a current fiscal year, thus eliminating any uncertainty about future year budgets.

Proposition I carries out the voters' intention that San Francisco pay a wage to police officers and firefighters equal to the average paid by other large California cities.

Vote Yes on Proposition I.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Eleven years ago the voters promised to pay our police and firefighters salaries equal to the average paid in the 5 largest cities in California.

In nine out of the eleven years since, a technicality about dates has prevented us from keeping our promise, and our police and firefighters have been paid less than the average salaries of California's 5 largest cities. They have been paid less than we promised to pay them.

It's about time we corrected this unfair situation. It's time to vote for Proposition I.

Members, Board of Supervisors

Nancy Walker
Bill Maher
Willie B. Kennedy
Harry Britt
Carol Ruth Silver
Doris Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your mayor, in 1975, a formula was offered as a method of compensating our police officers and firefighters the average wage paid to public safety officers in certain other California cities. That formula has failed 9 of 11 years since its enactment. Because of our mandatory deadline, we often pay our police officers and firefighters at a much lower rate. Even the original authors agree that the system needs to be corrected, thus allowing the original intent of the voters to be carried out. I urge you to join with me and vote yes on Proposition I.

Joseph Alioto, Former Mayor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Pay



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The existing pay formula for San Francisco Police and Firefighters provides that they shall be paid the average of the salaries paid to police and firefighters in four California cities (Los Angeles, San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose). The survey of salaries to establish equity is made on salaries paid prior to August 25th, the final date for the salary survey.

Often some of these cities settle their salaries for the current fiscal year **after** the August 25th deadline, retroactive to July 1st. The result is that the San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers are **deprived** of the salary increase until the following fiscal year.

This is contrary to the intent of the voters who approved the present pay formula. The proposed change would rectify this inequity and assure that San Francisco Firefighters and Police Officers would be paid the average pay received by other California jurisdictions.

Police and fire protection is vital for a safe city, and our police officers and firefighters are the key to that protection.

Help us continue the fine work that they do by supporting PROP. I.

Emmet Condon, Chief of S.F. Fire Dept.
Frank Jordan, Chief of S.F. Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As members of the San Francisco Police and Fire Commissions, we have the awesome responsibility to oversee the actions of our police officers and firefighters. As Commisssioners, we demand fairness, compassion and a responsible attitude from our police officers and firefighters. In return they have a right to ask from us the same. That's why we support Proposition I.

This measure corrects a flaw in the City Charter that fails to compensate our police officers and firefighters fairly for the often dangerous job they perform daily. This flaw has been in existence for eleven years and it has failed nine times. Police officers and firefighters do not have the luxury of failure in their jobs. As citizens of San Francisco, we cannot let our police officers and firefighters down and allow this weak law to continue to fail them.

Join with us and support PROPOSITION I—Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO COMMISSIONERS
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Pres.
Alfred J. Nelder, Vice-Pres.
Owen H. Davis, Comm.
Louis J. Giraudo, Comm.
Dr. Juanita Owens, Comm.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE COMMISSION
Henry L. Berman, Pres.
Curtis L. McClain, Vice-Pres.
Juanita Del Carlo, Comm.
Richard J. Guggenhime, Comm.
Anne Saito Howden, Comm.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As President of the Board of Supervisors, I have always fought for fairness both for you and for the people who serve you—our city employees.

Eleven years ago, the voters adopted a formula to set the wages of police officers and firefighters. The authors of that measure told the voters, "This will provide a fair average wage to our uniform services." However, because of an unforeseen flaw in the law the "fair average wage" has often not been given.

Proposition "I" will not change the formula but only correct the law to allow the city to carry out the intentions you stated eleven years ago.

Proposition "I" is fair. Please join with me and support fairness for our uniform services.

Vote Yes on Propositon "I".

John L. Molinari, President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As your elected representatives from San Francisco, we are critically aware of the peoples' need for justice and equity under the law. Proposition "I" will give firefighters and police officers the fair and equitable salary formula that the voters intended when they approved the wage formula in 1975.

We believe that it was the voters intent, in 1975, to pay our police officers and firefighters the "true" average of other California cities, but the fact is the true average is not being paid.

We must correct this injustice that has existed for the past eleven years. Proposition "I" will accomplish this. Proposition "I" is an equity measure, not an increase in benefits.

Those who protect our lives and property deserve our support. We are strongly urging you to vote yes on Proposition "I".

Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Art Agnos, Member of the Assembly
Honorable John Foran, Member of the Senate
Sala Burton, Member of Congress

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

I Police & Fire Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

It's not fair to promise a certain salary to an employee, and then consistently underpay him or her, time after time. That kind of treatment would be totally unacceptable in the private sector.

But that's just what we've been doing to our police officers and firefighters for the past 11 years.

Through no fault of theirs, our public safety employees have been cheated out of the pay to which they are rightfully entitled. The voters set the pay formula 11 years ago, but a technicality in the charter has subverted the will of the voters for nine of the past 11 years.

It's not fair.

Firefighers and police officers deserve to be paid the money they earn. Proposition I will let San Francisco keep its promise to the men and women who risk danger for us every day.

Let's vote YES on I.

William Murray, Former Fire Chief
Keith Calden, Former Fire Chief
Andrew Casper, Former Fire Chief
Al Nelder, Former Police Chief
Don Scott, Former Police Chief
Tom Cahill, Former Police Chief

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Fairness requires this amendment to the law. Police officers and firefighters who protect this city have a right to be paid at a rate similar to their counterparts in cities of "comparable" size.

The salaries of our police and firefighters are set by surveying pay scales in other communities. If a community in the salary survey pays its police and fire personnel at a higher rate, our protectors should not have to wait months to catch up. The task of protecting this city is not an easy one. Police officers and firefighters deserve fair treatment and fair pay. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

As police officers in San Francisco, we have a tremendously difficult job of protecting your personal safety. Our department works twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, to provide you with the best possible protection. Our work is demanding and often times goes without notice. We know that our system works best at protecting you.

We now are asking you for your protection from a system that has failed us nine times in eleven years. In 1975, the voters of San Francisco adopted a formula that sets the wages for public safety officers. The formula attempts to provide the average wage to police officers and firefighters in San Francisco that is given to our counterparts in California cities that serve a population of 350,000 or greater. However due to a flaw in the law, this formula has failed to compensate our officers with the average wage.

Proposition "I" will provide the true average wage that was intended by the voters in 1975. Proposition "I" will not change the formula but will only close the loophole that causes this continual failure.

Proposition "I" has broad based support from our Federal, State and local elected officials. More importantly, Proposition "I" is supported by Supervisor John Molinari, Supervisor Wendy Nelder and former Supervisor and present Police Commissioner, Al Nelder.

Proposition "I" will close forever the loophole that has stopped the will of the voters eight years ago. We urge you to follow the guidance of the voters in 1975 and correct this inequity by voting Yes on Proposition "I".

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officers' Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The nature of police and fire work means there are few clear-cut decisions and in the roles as Chiefs and Captains of the Police and Fire Departments in San Francisco, they are all hard ones. Prop. I is a rare, clear choice. It only asks for what is fair, what the voters truly intended when Prop. P passed in 1975. Not an increase, but an adjustment that will produce a fair average for police and fire compensation. The men and women of the S. F. Police and Fire Departments are there when you need them—be there for them at the polls.

Vote YES on PROP. I.

John Flaherty, President, Fire Chiefs Assoc.
Don Goad, President, Police Supervisory Officers Assoc.

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Police & Fire Age Requirements



PROPOSITION J

Shall the City eliminate maximum age limits for persons entering the police and fire departments, and eliminate mandatory retirement ages for the police and fire departments?

YES 299 ➡
NO 300 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: People over 32 years old cannot join the fire department, and people over 35 years old cannot join the police department. People joining the police or fire departments must meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Firefighters and police officers must retire when they become 65 years old.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would amend the Charter to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments. It would also eliminate mandatory retirement ages, and the requirement that people joining the police or fire departments meet the physical standards for enlisting in the armed forces of the United States. Bus operators and conductors would not have to live in San Francisco.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to eliminate maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to eliminate mandatory retirement ages.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep maximum age limits for people joining the police or fire departments, and you want to keep mandatory retirement ages.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, significantly affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 100

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

J Police & Fire Age Requirements

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

This measure will eliminate from the Charter maximum entry age requirements of 32 and 35 years of age and the mandatory retirement age of 65 years for police officers and firefighters.

Federal law prohibits mandatory age limits for employment where individualized testing can adequately measure fitness and ability to do the job. Both the police and fire departments have effective and reliable medical and physical performance standards for applicants and annual examinations for all members. All experts agree that job-related physical tests and medical examinations of applicants combined with annual review are more effective in selecting and keeping fit employees than fixed age requirements.

As our population ages and the benefits of physical fitness become a certainty, mandatory age limits become increasingly unfair. It is a medically verified fact that the aging process varies from individual to individual according to diet, weight, smoking and alcohol consumption, inherited traits, and many other factors. A man or woman who can pass the medical and performance tests should be allowed to work as a police officer or firefighter without regard to age.

We should eliminate artificial barriers to employment opportunity. Each individual is entitled to consideration on his or her own merits. In addition, this amendment deletes obsolete provisions on physical fitness requirements unrelated to job duties and residency provisions that have been declared unenforceable by courts.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Unofficial Matter:

The Promise Fulfilled

By Sheriff Michael Hennessey

If I were to tell you I recently participated in the greatest democratic process in the history of civilization, what would come to mind? The inauguration of a president amid the pomp and ceremony of our nation's capitol? The crowning of a king or queen in some exotic faraway land? Perhaps, the experience of personally being elected to serve in public office.

While each of these examples is an electrifying representation of how people govern themselves, none match the simplicity and power of casting one vote in one election in the greatest and most successful democracy in history—the United States of America.

On June 3 of this year, I worked a fifteen-hour shift as an election officer, assisting voters in Precinct #2711 on Stockton Street in Chinatown. It was cold and windy when we opened our polling place at 7:00 a.m., but no one complained. People were already waiting to cast their ballots.

It was a scene repeated in thousands of garages, homes and buildings throughout our state and country: Voters arriving at their polling places to vote. This simple act, this hallowed tradition, is such a critical part of what makes America work.

Concerned citizens came before they started work, clutching their handbooks, pamphlets or a scribbled note to remind them how they would vote on a chilly June morning. An old woman, walking her grandchild to pre-school, labored up Sacramento Street and down the block to our polling place. She smiled as she signed the voter roster and said in halting English: "This is the first time I vote. I am a new citizen." I felt proud and pointed her to one of the seven voting booths. She took quite a while to work her way through the long ballot, but had a smile on her face when she emerged.

She had played an important role as an American. She had voted!

Nothing, for me, will ever come as close to defining the essential American experience as watching Americans exercise their right to vote. The commitment shown by dedicated voters was particularly inspiring in this "off" presidential year, when no great issues aroused national opinion, and where no great political leader stood poised to change the course of history. But, it is precisely when voter turnout is traditionally low that voting means so much to a democratic government.

In a world where hundreds of millions of people cannot choose who governs them, where oppression and an absence of basic human rights is commonplace, American citizens came to vote on Stockton Street that chilly, busy weekday.

To those who joined in this ultimate celebration of democracy, I congratulate you for caring. And I urge you to pass this torch of liberty on to your children and neighbors.

To those who chose not to vote, I urge you to reorder your priorities and I offer the words of President Andrew Jackson:

"Vote or be damned! Our nation, built with the blood of our forefathers, is diminished with every wasted opportunity to effect the nature of government. Nothing is of more importance in a living democracy!"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff of San Francisco. For the past several years he has helped the Registrar on election day by serving as a poll worker in various neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

(The Registrar currently has many vacant positions at the precinct on election day. Those willing to participate in this interesting aspect of community service are encouraged to apply at the Registrar's City Hall office.)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Art Curators Exemption

PROPOSITION K

Shall the City exempt all art curators from the civil service system?

YES 302
NO 303

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City hires curators to administer and maintain its art collections. Certain curators must be hired through the civil service system. Other curators are hired by their departments.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would amend the Charter to allow the City to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to hire all curators without going through the civil service system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to hire certain curators through the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter Amendment be approved, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 21 the Board of Supervisors voted 10–0 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

None of the supervisors present voted No.

Special Notice to Absentee Voters

If you are voting absentee, avoid the following pitfalls that may endanger your right to vote:

1) It is no longer legal to have someone else (other than the Post Office) deliver your ballot to the Registrar.

2) It is not advisable to give or mail your application for absentee ballot to someone else (such as a political party or campaign). Mail it directly to the Registrar to avoid any delay.

3) You must sign your name and address on the declaration on the back of the return envelope or your ballot will not be counted.

4) **Never** sign your ballot card or make any identifying marks on it. This makes your entire ballot void.

5) An application form is not necessary. A postcard or letter will do just as well.

6) Absentee ballots that are received after 8:00 p.m. on election day will not be counted.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 101

NO ARGUMENT WAS SUBMITTED AGAINST PROPOSITION K

K Art Curators Exemption

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

The City and County of San Francisco hires approximately fifty Curators in eight classifications who care for works of art in our museums and other public buildings or departments. Those working in museums are exempt from civil service testing. However, a small number outside museums are not exempt. This measure would make all Curators exempt and standardize the hiring procedure.

Curators are specialists with knowledge about the selection, care and history of objects. Their skills are virtually impossible to test. Each position requires different kinds of knowledge. Curators specialize in academic research areas such as Art of Ancient Greece and Rome; they also specialize in areas requiring knowledge of the Art medium: ceramics, oil and water paints, bronze sculptures, etc.

Even more difficult to test is the aesthetic knowledge of art; only by studying art and looking at art in depth for a period of time can a person acquire the special ability to judge its quality and to understand its importance to the world. Curators select art for purchase and decide what groups of art works belong together for an exhibition.

To individualize testing would be excessively costly since it would have to determine a person's taste and judgment ability.

Furthermore, testing for some positions while others are exempt is unfair. Personnel in the same classification are unable to transfer or promote in the same manner as other employees in identical classifications.

This amendment would allow departments which, like the museums, purchase, collect and exhibit art, to hire Curators in the same manner as museums. Departments which have exhibitions that require Curators but which are primarily for different purposes than collecting and exhibiting art would also be exempted. However, their appointments would be certified by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums to be certain the appointed Curators are qualified.

This amendment would standardize the hiring of Curators for the City at less cost, would save the time of personnel for unnecessary testing, and would help to obtain the best qualified people for San Francisco's art heritage.

Vote yes on Proposition K.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Testing cannot reveal the abilities that make an effective curator. Curators for the Arts Commission need unique abilities in being experts who can also work well with people and manage the demands of working within a large complex bureaucracy. Tests do not allow us to pinpoint and employ the best person. The Arts Commission needs to serve the public well. Please pass this measure to give us the means of selecting the most all-round capable employees as curators.

In fairness, it is right to put all curatorial jobs in the City on the same basis. This measure will allow all curatorial jobs to follow civil service except for exempting **all** from selection by examination. Curators in the City Museums have been exempted since 1948.

Jacqueline Nemerovski, President, S.F. Arts Commission
Robert La Rocca, Vice President, S.F. Arts Commission
Landscape Architecture
Jo Hanson, Art Commissioner
William Paterson, Art Commissioner
Stanley Eichelbaum, Art Commissioner, Writer, Restauranteur
Felix M. Warburg, Art Commissioner, Architect
Peter Rodriguez, Art Commissioner
George T. Rockrise, Art Commissioner
Dmitri Vedensky, Architect
Ian McKibbin White, Director & Chief Curator
The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

A yes vote will insure that all curators for the City are hired in a fair and equal manner. Proposition K is needed to continue quality exhibitions at the San Francisco International Airport and at the San Francisco Arts Commission Gallery. A yes vote makes possible hiring art experts with the skills required to conduct excellent public art programs and care for the City's art collections

Philip Agee, Artist
Paule Anglim Gallery
Ruth Asawa, Artist
Terese Bartholomew, Curator of Indian Art, Asian Art Museum
John Berggruen Gallery
Ruth Braunstein Gallery
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum
John Chiu, Chinatown Resource Center
David de la Torre, Director, Mexican Museum
Bonnie Earls-Solari, Curator, Bank of America
Richard Fong, Community Arts Inc.
Helene Fried, Adjunct Curator, Dept. of Architecture, SF Museum
Fuller-Goldeen Gallery
Stephen Goldstine, President, SF Art Institute
Yoshiko Kakudo, Curator of Japanese Art, Asian Art Museum
Pamela Koe, Museum Registrar
Michael Lerner, Producer, KGO-TV
Phil Linhares, Director, Mills College Art Gallery
Jesse McElroy, Artist
Tom Marioni, Artist
Masashi Matsumoto, Artist
Win Ng, Artist
Vernon Nulph, Personnel Officer, SF Airport
Stephen Penkowsky, Artist
Clarence Shangraw, Chief Curator, Asian Art Museum
Jeremy Stone Gallery
L. C. Spaulding Taylor, Artist
Bruce Velick Gallery
Ian McKibbin White, Director, Fine Arts Museums
Rene Yanez, Director, Galeria de la Raza
John McCarron, Director, Artspace

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

PROPOSITION M

Shall the City adopt mandatory priority policies for its Master Plan, extend limits on the development of new office space in San Francisco, and reduce the amount of new office development allowed under the Downtown Plan?

YES 305
NO 306

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: New office development throughout San Francisco is controlled by "the Downtown Plan," which is part of the City Planning Code. Development of all types is governed by the City's Master Plan.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would make major changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan. These changes would limit the amount of new office growth allowed under the Downtown Plan, and would add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan.

The Master Plan

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has adopted a "comprehensive, long-term general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county," known as the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes policies on issues such as land use, transportation, housing, conservation, open space, earthquake safety, and noise. The City Planning Department must advise the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission whether certain types of projects meet these policies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would require the City to add "Priority Policies" to the Master Plan, covering issues such as neighborhood businesses, affordable housing, commuter traffic, blue-collar jobs, historic preservation and open space. The City would not be allowed to approve any zoning ordinance or development agreement, or issue certain permits, unless it specifically determined that the ordinance, agreement or permit did not violate these policies.

Annual Limit: Expiration and Exemptions

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the Downtown Plan, there is a limit on the amount of new office space that may be constructed throughout the City. This limit applies until October of 1988, when it will expire. The limit does not apply to new office buildings of less than 50,000 square feet, and to certain developments that include housing. The Board of Supervisors may amend, extend or repeal the Downtown Plan without a vote of the people.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the Downtown Plan to keep the limit in effect until it is repealed by the voters. The limit would not apply to buildings of less than 25,000 square feet. The current exemption for certain developments that include housing would be removed. Exemptions for projects built under development agreements could only be passed by a vote of the people.

Annual Limit: Amount and Adjustment

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Downtown Plan limits construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a three-year total of 2,850,000 square feet until October of 1988. Certain projects have been exempted from this limit.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would limit construction of new office space throughout San Francisco to a total of 950,000 square feet per year. It would add a new requirement that at least 75,000 square feet of that total be for office buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet. Proposition M would add a formula requiring the City to subtract the square footage of exempted projects from the new annual limit.

Training and Placement Fee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Office developers must pay fees or spend money for public transit, housing, childcare, public art, and parks.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would also require the City to study and adopt a program to coordinate local programs on job training and placement for people who live in San Francisco. It also would require the City to consider charging office developers at least $1.50 a square foot if the City needs more money for this program.

What Your Vote Means

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to adopt these changes in the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the Downtown Plan and the Master Plan as they are now.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT IS AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE

Planning Initiative

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the Initiative Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application certain tax revenues of the City and County may be reduced in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount."

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

PART 1—MASTER PLAN

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding section 101.1 as follows:

SECTION 101.1. MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) The Master Plan shall be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for San Francisco. To fulfill this requirement, after extensive public participation and hearings, the City Planning Commission shall in one action amend the Master Plan by January 1, 1988.

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the Master Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the Master Plan are resolved:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and,

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

(c) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after November 4, 1986, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the Priority Policies established above.

(d) The City may not adopt any zoning ordinance or development agreement authorized pursuant to Government Code Section 65865 after January 1, 1988, unless prior to that adoption it has specifically found that the ordinance or development agreement is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

(e) Prior to issuing a permit for any project or adopting any legislation which requires an initial study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and prior to issuing a permit for any demolition, conversion or change of use, and prior to taking any action which requires a finding of consistency with the Master Plan, the City shall find that the proposed project or legislation is consistent with the Priority Policies established above. For any such permit issued or legislation adopted after January 1, 1988 the City shall also find that the project is consistent with the City's Master Plan.

PART 2—ANNUAL LIMIT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsections 320(b) and 320(g)(1) are amended as follows:

SECTION 320. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: DEFINITIONS.

(b) "Approval period" shall mean the twelve-month period beginning on October 17, 1985 and each subsequent twelve month period.

(g) "Office development" shall mean construction, modification or conversion of any structure or structures or portion of any structure or structures, with the effect of creating additional office space, excepting only:

1. Development which will result in less than 25,000 square feet of additional office space.

Subsection 320(g)(5) is deleted and the existing Subsections renumbered.

Subsection 320(k) is added as follows:

(k) "Preexisting office space" shall mean office space used primarily and continuously for office use and not accessory to any use other than office use for five (5) years prior to Planning Commission approval of an office development project which office use was fully legal under the terms of San Francisco law.

Subsection 321(a)(1) is ammended as follows:

SECTION 321. OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: ANNUAL LIMIT.

(a) Limit.

1. No office development may be approved during any approval period if the additional office space in that office development, when added to the additional office space in all other office developments previously approved during that approval period, would exceed 950,000 square feet or any lesser amount resulting from the application of Section 321.1. To the extent the total square footage allowed in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period.

A new Subsection 321(b)(4) is added as follows and existing subsections renumbered:

(4) Reserve for Smaller Buildings. In each approval period at least 75,000 square feet of office development shall be reserved for buildings between 25,000 and 49,999 square feet in gross floor area of office development. To the extent the total square footage allowed under this subsection in any approval period is not allocated, the unallocated amount shall be carried over to the next approval period and added only to the Reserve for Smaller Buildings.

Section 321.1 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.1. ANNUAL LIMIT ADJUSTMENT.

(a) It is the intention of the people of San Francisco that the annual limit on office development be reduced to account for the square footage resulting from the excessive number of building, alteration and site permits that were issued after November 29, 1984, the date the City Planning Commission amended the Master Plan to include the Downtown Plan.

(b) Not later than January 1, 1987 and January 1 of each subsequent year the Department of City Planning shall survey the records of the Central Permit Bureau and any other necessary records to develop a list of the square footage of all office development projects for which building, alteration or site permits were issued after November 29, 1984 that have not lapsed or otherwise been revoked, and all office development projects reapproved by the City, the Redevelopment Agency or the San Francisco Port Commission after November 29, 1984. Reapproval specifically includes any project

(continued on page 103)

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M will: take control of the City's politics and the City's economic policies **out** of the hands of developers and their political pressures and contributions; limit growth by closing the loopholes in the City's Downtown Plan, and eliminating the exemptions granted by the Board of Supervisors; require that future growth meet certain standards for economic development and the quality of life; and require that the Board of Supervisors create a unified and coherent job training and placement program.

The problems that past overdevelopment has created for all San Franciscans are clear: over-crowded streets, freeways, parking, and public transportation; the loss of affordable housing and neighborhood serving small businesses; and a distorted and unbalanced "one-crop" economy, narrow in its opportunities, vulnerable to mergers and technological change, and greedy in its consumption of city services.

It is also clear now that only a citizen's initiative can truly control downtown growth and eliminate the unhealthy political situation where developers contribute massive sums of money to the campaigns of those who are supposed to regulate them. Despite campaign promises made in 1979 and 1983 when the last growth-control measures where on the ballot—and despite the campaign promises still being made—millions of square feet were exempted from the Downtown Plan and millions of square feet have been and will be built without control. Politicians cannot be expected to bite the hand that feeds them, and out-of-town developers cannot be expected to put the interests of San Franciscans first.

Only San Franciscans can save San Francisco. There is still time to stop the wheeling and dealing, to close developer loopholes, and to decide our own future. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Yes on M Steering Committee:

Dick Grosboll
Dennis Antenore
Jim Handler
Sue Hestor
Geraldine Johnson
Michael Lighty
Esther Marks
Jim Morales
Jack Morrison
Pat Norman
Alan Raznick
Calvin Welch
Susan Weisberg
Chantale Wong

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Rush hour on our busses, our freeways, and our city streets now lasts at least 4-6 hours each day. We cannot sit, we can barely stand on our busses, we can't drive our cars, and we certainly can't park—there are 385,000 parking places in all of San Francisco, and there are 400,000 commuter cars every day.

Despite election-time promises made in 1979 and 1983—during the last anti-highrise campaigns—the new, so-called "controls" in **current** City planning policies will allow at least 20,000 **more** automobiles on our streets and freeways and at least 30,000 **new** MUNI riders over the next 14 years, and directly targets 6000 existing parking spaces for destruction.

Don't be fooled by election-time promises! VOTE YES ON M.

Jim Buker
David Jones
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transit Commission
Bruce Marshall
Norman Rolfe
Richard Sklar

(Organizations listed for identification purposes only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

From Mark Twain to Jack London, from Dashiell Hammett to Clifford Still, from Robert Motherwell to the Grateful Dead to Alice Walker, this City's arts and artists have made it a vital, important, and cosmopolitan city. Past highrise over-development has already forced our artists out of North Beach. Present City Planning policies target the arts community in the South of Market for highrise expansion, and artists are now being driven completely out of town.

Save our City's diversity, excitement, and artistic promise and prominence. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M**

Ruth Asawa
John Behanna
August Coppola, Dean, School of Creative Arts, SF State
Stephen Goldstine, Chair, California Arts Council
Lynn Hershman, Chair, Interdisciplinary Arts Program, SF State
Ric Pacurar, Executive Director, Project Artaud
Mark Rennie
Stephen Shapiro, Director, SF Community Music Center
Fred Sonnenberg, Executive Director, School of the Arts Foundation
Anne Marie Theilen, Executive Director, S.F. Neighborhood Arts Program

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M expands opportunities for small businesses, our neighborhood, affordable housing and our city's youth. Join me in voting YES ON M!

Art Agnos, Assemblyman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Over the past 15 years, San Francisco has built over 30,000,000 square feet of commercial office highrise buildings. This has been the largest building boom in any city in the history of our country, but there has been little or no work for black construction workers, black contractors, black architects, or black engineers. After these buildings are finished, only 1.8% of the jobs go to San Francisco Blacks, despite promises each election time that downtown growth is good for the Black community.

It isn't true. Downtown growth has **not** been good for the Black community. The Black population of San Francisco has significantly declined and Black political influence appears to be fading. Black unemployment has risen. Real pay scales for black workers have fallen. Sky-high housing costs force more Blacks to leave town daily. Traffic and transit conditions add hours of unpleasantness to already difficult working days.

Let's trust ourselves and **not** the promises of politicians, developers, and their friends. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

Limit high rise growth and development, require that the City preserve housing, economic diversity, blue collar jobs and local businesses, and direct the Board of Supervisors to pass a job training program that works. Vote Yes on M for our future in San Francisco.

Jule Anderson
James Bell
Lois Blanchard
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Vera L. Clanton
Terry Collins
Darryl Cox
Ina Dearman
Michael Edwards
Barbara Garner
Rev. Dr. Howard Gloyd
Yvonne Scarlett-Golden
Rev. Roland Gordon
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Geraldine Johnson
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Enola Maxwell
A.J. Mitchell
Joel Mitchell
Pat Norman
Cati Okorie
Jim Queen
Joe Rudolph
Hiram Smith
Ida Strickland
Charles Turner, Jr.
Amelia A. Ward
Simeon White

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Soon you may have to go to San Jose to get your shoes repaired.

Neighborhood-serving merchants, community meeting places, and small employers are being driven out of business or out of town by direct highrise expansion, or by its effects on all our neighborhoods—higher rents, denser traffic, neighborhood turnover, office conversions, and parking problems.

San Francisco needs a healthy small business economy. Small businesses make our neighborhoods liveable and convenient; and are the major source of new jobs and economic opportunity.

PROPOSITION M will control highrise growth and expansion and require sensible planning to preserve existing jobs, to encourage neighborhood-serving businesses, to promote economic diversity, and to enhance economic opportunity.

VOTE YES ON M.

John Behanna, Wolfe & Associates
Dan Dugan, Dan Dugan Sound and Design
Pat Flanagan, Standard Fisheries
Donald Grimes, The Grimes Agency
Henrik Jorgensen, Nordika Scandanavian Furniture
Gilman Louie, NEXA
Chris Martin, The Cannery
Betty Mosias, Far Out Fabrics
Mark Rennie, Nine, The Billboard Cafe
Margaret Wosser, Towne Tub Laundramat

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Women, elderly and young, bear the highest costs of badly planned and regulated highrise growth and development.

Highrise development has created a demand for housing which has pushed housing costs beyond the reach of all but the most advantageously employed. Women, and particularly the women who head over half the City's poverty-line families, can no longer afford to live here.

A one-crop economy of highrise offices has trapped women in low-paying service and clerical positions. Women in San Francisco earn 49¢ for every dollar earned by men—10% below the national average.

Highrise office development creates demands on the City budget to provide MUNI services, police and fire protection, and water and sewer services to highrise office buildings. Meanwhile services for people go lacking. Nine out of ten recipients of social service monies are women—but City budget priorities provide for downtown highrises.

Proposition M calls for the transformation of City priorities to provide for a diverse economy, improved City services, affordable housing, and the preservation of families.

A vote for Proposition M is a vote for the future of women in San Francisco. **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.**

NOW, San Francisco Chapter

Anne Daley
Catherine Dodd
Paula Lichtenberg
Phyllis Lyon
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Del Martin
Sue Martin
Pat Norman
Linda Post
Esta Soler
Nancy Walker, Supervisor

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The controversial Downtown Plan does not stem the City's highrise boom. Nor does it safeguard the future of San Francisco for its residents, workers and businesses. Major loopholes in the Downtown Plan allow the highrise boom to continue unabated, further fueling astronomical housing costs, exacerbating pressures which threaten neighborhood businesses, and straining already overcrowded public transit, streets and freeways.

Proposition M plugs the Downtown Plan's loopholes, allows a manageable rate of new development, and requires the City to develop a desperately needed long range plan to address the City's growth and planning problems.

Proposition M establishes policy priorities for residents and small businesses of our City.

Proposition M also requires the Board of Supervisors to adopt a long overdue job training and placement program for resident San Franciscans to ensure that new jobs are filled by residents of our City, not commuters.

We urge that you vote Yes on Proposition M.

Submitted by

Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior citizens say VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M. The Manhattanization of San Francisco has meant the Manhattanization of our lives—higher rents and living costs, more crime, fewer social services, and deteriorating public transit.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and eliminate the special privileges in the City's current development ordinance, and impede this city's rush to further Manhattanization. Stop the wheeling and dealing downtown and close the developers' loopholes. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Adelaide and Arnet Amos
Miriam Blaustein
Amy Cooper
Winifred Cottrell, Housing Committee, Gray Panthers
Betty Garvey, Diamond Senior Center
Sherry Gendelman, Director, Gray Panthers
Mary Lou Goeke
Daniel Humphrey
Denise Kessler
Mary J. O'Brien
Rita Sadek
Dr. Helen Sobell
Susan Taylor

(Organizations listed for identification only)

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Vote Yes on M to establish once again in San Francisco the traditional balanced growth strategy followed by our city during the first half of this century.

Vote Yes on M so that San Francisco once again can achieve its true ecomonic potential and thereby provide the people of San Francisco

- tens of thousands of jobs;
- lower housing costs;
- smaller tax burden;
- better utilization of streets, transit systems, freeways and bridges;
- a more liveable city.

For a better San Francisco—for greater growth of our city—for a greater prosperity for all San Franciscans—for a liveable city—

I urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!**

John Bardis, Former member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a sound neighborhood planning and reasonable office growth control measure.

It improves neighborhood planning by requiring the City to amend the Master Plan after holding extensive public hearings and establishes priority policies as guidelines for the Master Plan and zoning laws—with special emphasis on housing and small businesses and improving transit.

The priority policies provide the City with sufficient flexibility to protect neighborhoods from overdevelopment while allowing beneficial projects.

Proposition M is true growth control—as contrasted to the Downtown Plan—which was not an adequate response to the problems caused by rampant office development. With its many loopholes and exemptions, the Downtown Plan represented poor planning—which will exacerbate our housing, transit, commuter traffic, neighborhood parking and congestion problems.

Proposition M will close the loopholes and put the people of San Francisco in control of the rate of office growth.

Given the developer-controlled planning process and two decades of overdevelopment, we need Propostion M.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's Latino community and culture have always been and still are a prime target of our City's poorly planned growth and development policies. From the days of the destruction of our neighborhoods and neighborhood-serving businesses by the BART construction in the Mission, to the present danger of highrise encirclement on the North and the East, we have borne the costs of development without receiving benefits.

Affordable housing in San Francisco has all but disappeared, forcing many of our friends and neighbors further and further out of town, and forcing many others into overcrowded living conditions. Many of our small businesses and jobs have been driven out by highrise expansion, while only 2.4% of all downtown jobs have gone to Hispanics. Our access to an honest and open political process has been drowned in a vast sea of campaign contributions by developers to a favored few.

PROPOSITION M will require the preservation of affordable housing, small businesses, existing jobs, neighborhood character and diversity, and will end loopholes and special privileges for developers. VOTE YES ON M.

Yolanda Alcantar
Al Borvice
Marie Acosta Colon
Tony Colon
Mike Garza
Robert Gonzalez
Jose Medina
Jim Morales
Celso Ortiz
Alfredo Rodriguez
Gloria Rodriguez
Gene Royale
Alice Villagomez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS URGE A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has been bad for your neighborhood. It has

—increased housing demand, pushing up rents and home prices;

—increased demolition of single family homes to make way for ugly apartment buildings, many with illegal units;

—increased the conversion of housing to commercial uses, including offices, bed and breakfast hotels and time-share condominiums;

—crowded our MUNI vehicles, congested our streets and freeways, and burdened neighborhood parking;

—sharply increased commercial rents, forcing out long-treasured neighborhood-serving businesses; and

—made downtown into a series of dark, windswept canyons.

The development interests who make large campaign contributions have riddled the Downtown Plan with so many exemptions and loopholes that it is almost meaningless. Proposition M's growth limits put teeth back into the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, by strengthening the City's Master Plan, Proposition M better protects our neighborhoods from unwarranted residential and commercial development. These protections will make San Francisco a more livable city.

PROPOSITION M'S SENSIBLE AMENDMENTS WILL PERMIT BALANCED GROWTH WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS OR OUR ECONOMY.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
(made up of 37 neighborhood organizations located throughout the City)

Alamo Square Neighborhood Association
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Cow Hollow Improvement Association
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Nob Hill Neighbors
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Twin Peaks Council

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PUT SOME PUNCH IN THE DOWNTOWN PLAN! CLOSE SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS AND DEVELOPER LOOPHOLES! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

The Downtown Plan and its Annual Limit could have been the most far-reaching development controls ever.

But the City gutted its effectiveness by inserting so many loopholes and exemptions that the Plan is almost meaningless.

Proposition M restores the Downtown Plan's integrity, and ensures its controls remain effective despite the influence of special interests.

More importantly, Proposition M restores the integrity of our City's Master Plan. It *requires* the Planning Commission to pay attention to the needs and concerns of San Franciscans. In short, it gives you a better shake against insensitive projects and developers than you're getting now.

VOTE YES.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE PEOPLE NEED PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will change the way planning is done in San Francisco. That's why City Hall is so afraid of it. That's also why they are lying to you.

They don't want you to know that even Los Angeles has zoning that follows its Master Plan. San Francisco doesn't.

They don't want you to know that the Master Plan is internally inconsistent—despite state law that requires consistency.

They don't want you to know that YOUR priorities aren't THEIR priorities. And that it's not too late to reclaim our City for its residents.

San Franciscans have been pleading for controls on franchise operations and preservation of neighborhood-serving small businesses for over a decade. In response to Proposition O on the 1979 ballot the Department started the first of THREE versions of neighborhood commercial controls. We still have nothing. Meanwhile Southern Pacific gets whizbang service. The Downtown Plan—THEIR priority—gets through in four years.

The Master Plan says it's important to save industrial uses and small businesses south of Market. The City's zoning permits their displacement and the Planning Department decides that office uses are just peachy in land zoned "Heavy Industrial."

Proposition M requires the City to comprehensively address its Master Plan. To listen to you and then act. Instead of following the whispered desires of developers in backrooms.

Don't listen to the distortions of City Hall. Read the Priority Policies proposed for the Master Plan. If those are YOUR priorities for San Francisco, vote Yes on Proposition M and re-claim our City for its residents.

Sue Hestor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CHINATOWN NEEDS PROPOSITION M

418 Chinatown residential hotel units lost in 1980–82. Low-income housing at 1000 Montgomery lost forever through conversion to now-vacant offices. 1,700 housing units in the Chinatown core "disappear" between 1970 and 1980. Low-income family housing and small businesses threatened by displacement by luxury housing at the Orangeland site. The International Hotel demolished. The continuing clash with downtown developers who want to build offices in an overbuilt market. A process that doesn't produce housing despite the clear need for it.

The Planning Commission keeps telling us that it lacks the legal tools to keep housing and small businesses in Chinatown—that they have no ability to "just say no."

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M TO SAVE CHINATOWN

Proposition M requires the City to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. Preserve and enhance existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and opportunities for resident employment. Protect our parks, such as Portsmouth Square, from shadow. It gives the City the tools AND THE MANDATE to say "no" to those who would destroy affordable housing and small businesses.

Chinatown is a valuable source of low-income family and senior housing. And many family-run small businesses. Keep those resources in Chinatown. Vote Yes on Proposition M.

Florence Chan
Gordon Chin
Alton Chinn
Cynthia Joe
Clifford Lee
Edwin Lee
Deborah Lim
Gilman Louie
Lorraine Lowe
Maurice Lim Miller
David Prowler
Alicia Wang
Chantale Wong
Leslie Yee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrises mean high rents. Downtown overdevelopment has meant cut-throat competition for land, cut-throat competition for housing and apartments, and the disappearance of affordable housing. We now have more evictions, less parking, more congestion, and no seats on the MUNI.

Renters say: Stop the wheeling and dealing! Close loopholes for developers. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M.

Affordable Housing Alliance
Council of Community Housing Organizations
San Francisco Tenants' Union
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Richard Allman
Ellen Baughman
Hank Barnard
Larry Beach Becker
Connie Brandon
David Brigode
Robert De Vries
Brian Doohan
Jim Faye
Eva Cheng Gardner
Sandra Gartzman, S.F. Housing and Tenants Council
Marc Janowitz
Jack Judkins
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
Milo Nadler, 825 Post Street Tenants Association
Jodi Reid
Steve Schectman
Robert Sheppard
Shirley St. George
Paul Wartelle
Landis Whistler, Stonestown Tenants Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

As the largest single land development in San Francisco's history, Mission Bay presents the city with a major opportunity to demand construction of thousands of housing units that working people can afford—housing to help meet the city's needs as well as the demand created by the project itself. Mission Bay must also provide adequate transportation, open space and the services and amenities to make it a liveable and workable new San Francisco neighborhood.

Proposition M provides that to obtain an exemption from the annual limit, a development such as Mission Bay must be placed on the ballot at a general election. This need to meet the test of genuine public accountablility can help ensure that the final Mission Bay plan will be responsive to the city's needs.

Judy Baston
Philip DeAndrade
Jim Firth
Ruth Gravanis
Kayren Hudiburgh
Tom Jones
Joe Passen
Ruth Passen
Regina Sneed
Lester Zeidman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

San Francisco's policy of unlimited office development during the last decade has had a disastrous effect on the City and Bay Area's environment—causing intolerable local and regional traffic congestion; severe strains on parking and transit; outrageous housing prices; loss of open space; shading of parks and open space and unpleasant and unhealthy pollution and noise levels.

The Downtown Plan had too many loopholes. It was not the answer. Neighborhood planning has been weak too.

Vote Yes on Proposition M for sound planning in the neighborhoods and reasonable limits on office development.

Sierra Club, S.F. Chapter
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Greenbelt Congress, S.F. Chapter
Open Space Conservancy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

REPUBLICAN LEADERS FOR PROP. M

As individual members of the San Francisco Republican County Central Committee, we deeply care about the future economic growth and orderly development of our City By The Golden Gate.

Proposition M is a responsible measure to allow for needed construction of up to approximately 1,000,000 square feet of business space per year. Development beyond such a point on an annual basis would only lead to more rush-hour traffic jams and other costly demands on City services.

Republican County Committee Members

Terence Faulkner
Robert Silvestri
Mike Garza
Tom Spinosa
Stanely Bramwell

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current City Land use and development policies provide special privileges to a few developers at the expense of the integrity of our political processes and the well-being of the vast majority of San Franciscans.

Massive political contributions from a handful of developers have created loopholes, exemptions, and City policies which permit and encourage commercial highrise growth to destroy affordable housing, economic, racial, and ethnic diversity, blue collar jobs, neighborhood liveability, and the quality of the environment in San Francisco.

Close developer loopholes! VOTE **YES** ON M.

The San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will require that our city government work to preserve affordable housing, small businesses, and the community and diversity in our neighborhoods. It will, at last, bring San Francisco into conformity with state laws requiring all other counties to make planning decisions according to a well thought-out, coherent land use Master Plan—**not** according to the power and influence of developers' campaign contributions.

VOTE YES ON M. Preserve our communities, our sense of community, and our ability to participate in an open and honest political system.

The Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ABSENT VOTER BALLOT APPLICATION

Application must be received by the registrar of voters no later than 10/28/86.

Election Date November 4, 1986

MAIL COMPLETED FORM TO:

Registrar of Voters
Room 155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Prec. No. _____
A.V. Prec. No. _____
Ballot Type _____
Affidavit No. _____
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

_____ _____
Date Deputy Registrar

PLEASE PRINT REGISTERED NAME:

_____
FIRST NAME MIDDLE NAME LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE *P.O. BOX NUMBER*):

_____
DATE OF BIRTH

_____
NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP

X _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE

I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

_____
RESIDENCE TELEPHONE

THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT PROPER SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE)

STREET OR BOX _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE.

Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as PERMANENT ABSENT VOTERS. Contact the Registrar of Voters for further information.

FROM:

_____

_____

_____

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

Place Postage Here
14¢
Coloque la estampilla aqui

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Highrise growth and development cause massive economic dislocation in San Francisco each day. Between 1970 and 1980, while the City built over 15 million square feet of commercial office highrise, the number of employed San Franciscans fell from 318,000 to 306,000. Mergers, acquisitions, housing and transit problems, and the depression in the oil industry have cost the City 24,000 jobs recently among its major highrise tenants.

Yet the City's ability to respond to these dislocations is severely limited. In fiscal year 1984–85, when 21,000 San Franciscans were unemployed and 12,000 San Franciscans withdrew from the labor force due to discouragement, the City's job training and placement program enrolled only 3824 students and placed only 1641.

Proposition M would help arrest the rate of dislocation, would require that city planners work to preserve jobs and create economic opportunities, and mandate the Board of Supervisors to create a unified, coherent, and more soundly financed job training and placement program.

VOTE YES OF PROPOSITION M.

Judy Baston
Gordon Chin
Jim Elliot
Geraldine Johnson
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Al Lannon
Mike Lighty
David Looman
Dr. Juliane Malveaux
Jose Medina
Dennis Mosgofian
Joe Passen
Jim Queen

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUPPORT THE DOWNTOWN PLAN!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION M!

Proposition M is **vital** to our City's future. It is an attempt by a broad-based group of citizens and organizations to strengthen and expand the innovative policies of the Downtown Plan.

Proposition M eliminates special interest exemptions granted by supervisors and restores the integrity of the Downtown Plan. It extends the Plan's growth control limits beyond the 1988 expiration date artificially set by the supervisors. And it closes the Board's debilitating loopholes.

Proposition M protects neighborhood merchants and our City's small businesses, the most important sectors of San Francisco's economic growth.

It provides you, the voters of San Francisco, the final word on exemptions from the Downtown Plan.

And it forces the supervisors to put the needs of resident San Franciscans ahead of the wishes of special interests and out-of-town developers.

Join us in voting **YES** on Proposition M.

Hon. Sue Bierman
Hon. Doug Engmann
Hon. Doris Kahn
Hon. Del Martin
Hon. Phyllis Lyon
Hon. Jack Morrison
Hon. Dale Carlson
Hon. David Looman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M:

Affordable Housing Alliance
Alamo Square Improvement Club
Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Anza Vista Improvement Club
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens for Representative Government
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Council of Community Housing Organizations
Cow Hollow Association
Democratic Socialists of America
Diamond Heights Neighborhood Association
District One Political Action (Richmond District)
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
Friends of Noe Valley
Glen Park Association
Golden Gate Democratic League
Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association
Greenbelt Congress, San Francisco Chapter
Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC)
Muni Coalition
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Local 15
National Organization of Women, San Francisco Chapter (NOW)
Nob Hill Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors
North Mission Association
North of Market Planning Coalition
Open Space Conservancy
Pacific Heights Residents Association
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors (PLAN)
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
San Francisco Humanist Party
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters (SFLV)
San Francisco Tenants' Union
San Francisco Tomorrow (SFT)
Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter
Stanyan-Fulton Neighborhood Association
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARE)
Sunset-Parkside Education Action Committee (SPEAK)
Sunnyside Neighborhood Association
Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Twin Peaks Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Uncontrolled downtown growth has had a radical effect on all of San Francisco. Traffic and housing costs are becoming intolerable, small merchants and industrial jobs are being forced out of the city, services are decreasing. Yet the new Downtown Plan is riddled with special interest exemptions. And it will require huge public investments to make possible further growth.

Proposition M will make the Downtown Plan do what it promises by closing its loopholes. It will also require the City to prepare a Master Plan that recognizes community values broader than highrise growth. These values include:

- Better public transit.
- Preserving and building affordable housing.
- Protecting a diverse economic base.
- Preserving neighborhood businesses.
- Preserving landmarks.
- Earthquake preparedness.

San Franciscans must decide if San Francisco belongs to them or to the downtown speculators who are mining it. I urge you to vote Yes on M.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Richard Abrahams
Eileen Adams
Catherine Accardi
Katharine Adams
Yvette Williams Van Aggelen
Honorable Art Agnos
Thomas Ahern
Darius Aidala
Angela Alioto
Boyd Allen
Christopher M. Ames
Jean Amos
Dean Anderson
Karen Apana & Peter Pursley
Buck Bagot
John Bardis
Robert Barnes
Robert Barth
J. Peter Baumgartner
Helen Bean
Nan & Howard Becker
Hugh Bell
Maurice Belote
William Benning
Beverly Berg
Honorable Susan Bierman
Lois Blanchard
Dian Blomquist
Michael Blumlein
Charles Bolton
Gray Brechin
Selma Brown
Linda Boyd
Georgia Brittan
Arthur Brunwasser
Dale Carlson
Robert Canning
Rene Casenave
Linda Chapman
Susan Chelone
Marjorie Childs
Marie Cleasby
Elaine Conti
Amy Cooper
Neil Copertini
Zach Cowan
Stan Crillolas
Ann Crow
Denise D'Anne
Dorothy Dana
N. Arden Danekas
Peggy da Silva
John Davids
Anne Marie Day
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Larry DeSpain
Carla Diamond
Jerome Dodson
Herbert Donaldson
Ella Driscoll
Alvin Duskin
Michael Edwards
John Elberling
Ed Emerson
Honorable Douglas Engmann
Frank Eppich
Roberto Esteves
Becky Evans
Don Feeser
Rhoda Feldman
James Flower
Ann Fogelberg
Nancy Foley
James Frankel
Tully Friedman
Edwin Gabay
Marcia Gallo
Ellis Gans
Jim Gardner
Marsha Garland
Betty Garvey
Gustavia Gash
Gabriel Gesmer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We also support Proposition M:

Richard Goldman
Larry Granader
Jeannette Harris
Rick Hauptman
Dorothea Heinz
Robert Herman
Jane Herzog
Bill Hester
Sue Hestor
Paul Hoar
Don Hodapp
Jan and Maur Holloway
John Holtzclaw
Deborah Honig
Victor Honig
Ralph House
Mike Housh
Daniel Humphrey
Harline Hurst
Jerry Hurtado
Sally Huyser
Carl Imparato
Joan Intrator
Agar Jaicks
Juan Alana Jelinek
Cynthia Joe
Sharon Johnson
Hope Jolles
David Jones
Elayne Jones
Ruth and Morris Kadish
Robert Katz
Joe Kaufman
Jennifer Kaysen
Jack W.R. Kelly
Mr. & Mrs. Noel Kirshenbaum
Tony Kilroy
Kate Monico Klein
Susan Klugerman
John Knox
Peggy Kopman
Honorable Jean Kortum
Steven Krefting
Henry Kroll
Ira Kurlander
S.S. Kush
Mary Lane
Jim Lansdowne
Norman Larson
Polly Layer
Beatrice Levine
Peter Linenthal
Dr. Larry Lipkind
Lorraine Lowe
Joan Lumbard
Kevin Malone
Honorable Susan Martin
Ralphyne MacDonald
Paulette and Robert Hale McConnell
Helen L. McGill
Liz Milazzo
Frederick Miller
Maurice Lim Miller
Frank Mastro
Nan McGuire
Will McKay
John Mehring
Carole Migden
Vivian Miller
Michael Minthorn
Stephanie Mischak
Tim Molinare
Jack Moore

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

We support Proposition M—the San Francisco Campaign for Accountable Planning Initiative.

Honorable Jack Morrison
Dennis Morse
Betty Mosaic
Dennis Moske
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Richard Navarro
Andy Nash
Rev. Carole Nelson
Mark Northcross
Jane Nurre
Mary O'Brien
Celso Ortiz
June Osterberg
Rick Pacurar
Dick Pabich
Elizabeth Page
Grace Macduff Parker
Tish Pearlman
Helen Peet
Robert Pender
George Post
Sandy Powell
Sylvia Powell
Ramona
William Renner
Nina Van Rensselaer
Jim Rivaldo
John Riordan
Rhoda Robinson
George Rockrise
Norman Rolfe
Pamela Rosenthal
Janet Rossi
William M. Roth
William Rumpf
Erik Schapiro
E. Robert Scrofani
Herb Schwartz
Carole Sears
Cy Shain
Kevin Shelley
Marsh Shires
Jim Schoch
Ron Silliman
Arthur Simon
Arlo Hale Smith
Fred Smith
Scott Smith
Kenneth Smith
Regina Sneed
Bill Sorro
Charlie Starbuck
Peter Stern
Tim Stirton
Janet Storm
Joan Strasser
Howard Strassner
Linda Stupski
Ed Sullivan Jr.
Jack Sullivan
Heida Swarts
Louise Swig
Stephen Taber
Susan Taylor
Paul Thurston
Ellen Trabilcy
Marie Utzig
David Veale
Joel Ventresca
Chandler Visher
David Vogel
Daniel Volkmann Jr.
Joan Von Briesen
Fred Wagner
Doris Brinn Walker
Phyllis Walker
Rich Waller
Sue Warburg
Frank Washington
Francis Werner
Paul Wessel
Ann Wettrich
Lyle Wing
Richard Winn
Rosalind Wolf
Mike Wong
Rich Yurman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not needed to control growth downtown. The fact is that not a single highrise has been approved in 1986, and none will be. Strong, effective controls already are in place, and they are working.

What "M" does do is involve the whole city in a complicated scenario of well intentioned—but potentially disastrous—tests for any building project anywhere in the city. These would undermine every civic, housing, light industrial and neighborhood revitalization project.

For instance, if "M" were law today, the renovation of Hamm's Brewery at 15th and Bryant into the Food Service Trade Center, with 395 jobs, could have been stopped because a few small businesses had to be displaced. (All were relocated in the City.)

Also, the Franklin Square Industrial Center in the Mission, the largest new industrial building in the City in 15 years, could have been sued because it replaced a small mattress factory in a fire-damaged warehouse.

Using a section on preserving existing housing, lawyers could have blocked construction of 120 low-to-middle income homes on Potrero Hill because they replaced a 14-unit apartment building.

The 203 affordable single-family homes planned for Balboa Reservoir could have been stopped by lawsuits based on Proposition M's clause for "conserving neighborhood character."

Using another section of the proposition on "conserving neighborhood-serving retail uses," lawyers for rundown liquor stores could block any plans to revitalize Third Street in the Bayview.

Furthermore, by limiting commercial development to 475,000 square feet a year for the next 15 years or more, Proposition M would effectively halt two major projects—Executive Park in Hunters Point with two office buildings and 450 homes and Mission Bay with 7500 homes and low-rise commercial and light-industrial development on now vacant railroad land. Only by costly elections could voters exempt these and other important projects.

Proposition M might provide work for lawyers, but it will provide opportunity for no one else. The City's ability to build homes, create jobs and replace blight would be dangerously crippled.

VOTE NO ON M.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the San Francisco we have built. It will ruin our hopes for the future.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renewal

In areas like Bayview, Hunters Point and the entire Third Street Corridor, we have fought hard to encourage the development of light industries to provide neighborhood jobs. Not only do these small businesses help provide jobs for the unemployed, but they will also help rebuild declining neighborhoods and reduce crime. Proposition M will stop all of this needed effort dead in its tracks!

Proposition M Destroys Jobs, Housing and Neighborhood Improvement

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

rundown storefronts on Third Street to new light industries and small businesses.

• Proposition M will rob us of funds for affordable housing and low cost childcare facilities.

• Proposition M will freeze decaying buildings in place and extend economic hardships by claiming to preserve cultural and economic diversity.

Proposition M Will Freeze Economic Discrimination in Place

In San Francisco, we've fought hard to make sure that economic benefits and opportunities reach all our residents, not just a previleged few. Instead of economic progress for all, Proposition M denies opportunities and benefits to those who need them most—minorities, working families and children. We need job development and urban renovation programs to rebuild our neighborhoods, not narrow-minded proposals such as Proposition M.

Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This is a well-intentioned ordinance which, unfortunately, has the same taint as the present so-called Downtown Plan. It establishes a peremptory limit on the amount of office space which could be built each year. It will lead to even more favoritism and perhaps even corruption in deciding who gets the right to build that arbitrary, limited amount of office space each year.

It is even worse than the Downtown Plan in that respect: The Downtown Plan has a limit of 950,000 square feet which could be built each year, but this initiative has a yearly limit of 475,000 square feet. That will make the reckless demands and pressure of aspiring office builders and promoters even worse. The limited allocation may become dependent on campaign contributions to an even greater extent that is now the case.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Since San Francisco is overbuilt, with an office vacancy rate of 18%, the solution is a year-to-year moratorium which will not be subject to political manipulation and can end when conditions so justify. I authored such legislation last year. It lost on a 6-5 vote, but I believe it is still merited. This sadly flawed measure aggravates the worst feature of the so-called Downtown Plan. That's why I'm voting against Proposition M. It's bad public policy and, respectfully, should be rejected by all of us.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The year-old Downtown Plan has been acclaimed as the most effective and balanced growth control document in the nation. However, a small group of anti-growth and anti-business activists want San Franciscans to dump the Plan in favor of Proposition M, an extreme measure that will hinder all kinds of local efforts to improve our neighborhoods citywide.

Propositon M destroys:

• Attempts to vitalize declining neighborhoods with new business opportunities.

• Construction of affordable housing funded by office building developers.

• Funding for low cost downtown childcare facilities.

The sponsors of Proposition M want you to believe that they are only tightening San Francisco's existing growth control laws. However, their misguided proposal will set many hidden and excessive restrictions in concrete.

Proposition M will:

• Create priority policies in the master plan which may prevent any renovation or conversion of dilapidated buildings in San Francisco's neighborhoods for new and useful purposes.

• Create a contradictory set of growth control laws which are so confusing only attorneys will profit from them.

• Hamper construction of needed affordable housing.

There are a number of comprehensive planning programs designed to control growth in San Francisco. These include the Downtown Plan, the South of Market Plan, the Mid-Market interim zoning, the Chinatown Plan, the Neighborhood Commercial re-zoning, the Tenderloin re-zoning and other residential and commercial down-zoning efforts. These programs are carefully crafted to limit destructive growth without causing serious economic damage to our City. We do not need a short-sighted and confusing initiative to destroy our City's neighborhoods and our economic vitality.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The "no new housing", "no growth", "no jobs", "no construction" lunatics are at it again! A CITYWIDE fifteen year "freeze" of development is preposterous! This is the sixth time the voters have said NO!

W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically affect every part of the City's economic base.

Proposition M will drive the cost of doing business in San Francisco up, resulting in even more businesses moving out. It also will deter new businesses from moving into the City. Local job opportunities will disappear and San Franciscans will have to commute to work in other cities.

Proposition M will destroy the future of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

San Francisco's neighborhoods serve as the foundation of our City because they are always changing and offering innovative new ideas. However, Proposition M's priority policies would freeze our neighborhoods in the past—virtually any type of improvement or the introduction of new businesses could legally be stopped, because it would alter the "existing neighborhood character." Proposition M would create a legal mess with disastrous effects on our neighborhoods.

Proposition M will force San Francisco to become a second class city with a diminished economic base and deteriorating neighborhoods. Please help save our City.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Henry E. Berman, President, San Francisco Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, President, Airport Commission
John Blumlein, Health Commission
Betty Jean Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Owen H. Davis, Member, Police Commission
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Louis J. Giraudo, San Francisco Police Commission
Thomas E. Horn, President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Louis Hop Lee, Civil Service Commission
Melvin D. Lee, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

On the surface, Proposition M seems like a good deal for small business, but in reality it will have a disastrous effect on the fastest growing sector of San Francisco's economy.

Our City's small business community has grown by over 13 percent in the last several years. It has created thousands of new jobs and opportunities for our residents. However, Proposition M will place a stranglehold on the growth of small businesses throughout the City. Did you know:

- Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood small businesses from expanding their operations and employing more people if new employees increase total MUNI ridership or drive to work.
- Proposition M's priority policies will stop small business people from bying dilapidated liquor stores along the Third Street Corridor and replacing them with thriving businesses.
- Proposition M will force the cost of office space to skyrocket throughout the City making it too expensive for new small businesses to locate in San Francisco and prevent existing firms from expanding and providing jobs for our residents.

The future of small businesses and the future prosperity of San Francisco are intertwined. Don't let Proposition M and its narrow-minded supporters ruin our economy or our neighborhoods!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON M.

Small Business Advisory Commissioners:
Susan Huskisson, President, Huskisson and Associates
Bruce Lilienthal, Attorney, President
District Council of Merchants
Steven Rascher, Executive Director
Golden Gate Business Association
George Rodriguez, Owner, Mi Rancho Market
Chuck Warner, Owner, Bayshore Metals

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The proponents of this ill-conceived proposition are playing to the public's uneasiness about the vast and rapid changes that have affected San Francisco in recent years. They have identified a simple target, office development, and argue that halting further office growth will stop change and "take San Francisco back from the developers". If their sincerity is beyond question, the naivete is abundant.

Stopping office growth will not undercut San Francisco as one of the dozen international business cities in the country. It will not deter people from migrating here. It will not stop the economic and technological changes that have affected the local economy. In fact, it will have little affect on San Francisco in the short run.

Over the long run, however, the initiative will drive up the cost of office space. When rents rose in 1978–1982, large employers moved some 25,000 jobs to the suburbs. Many of these jobs were held by women, minorities and young workers. When a shortage of office space develops and rents rise again, employers will begin to transfer more jobs out of the city. The initiative will thus only accelerate the upscale trends in San Francisco and reduce opportunities. It will also increase Bay Area traffic as more San Franciscans commute to the suburbs for work.

San Francisco has already made a strong commitment to growth management through the Downtown Plan. This backward looking proposition ignores the reality of San Francisco's future and will make it more difficult to maintain this City as a balanced, prosperous community.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

BAY AREA FUTURES SOCIETY
James Haas *Michael Bernick*
Mark Buell

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is not just anti-growth. Its anti-San Francisco-working people.

San Franciscans are employed in a wide variety of jobs from longshoremen to office workers, from bakers to department store clerks. All of these people have one thing in common—they need a vital and growing economy to ensure their jobs and quality of life. Proposition M will keep new employers out of the City and prevent existing employers from creating new jobs:

1. Proposition M will stop any growth or renovation on a city-wide basis. This will make the cost of doing business in San Francisco more expensive because the supply of retail and office space will be frozen and business rents will sky-rocket.
2. Propositon M's priority policies will prevent the conversion of failing retail businesses, like liquor stores and pornographic shops, into job-creating light industries and neighborhood businesses. The misguided supporters of Proposition M call this "preserving neighborhood character!"
3. Proposition M is not concerned with anyone's economic future or their dreams of owning a home. Proposition M will reduce the funds for, or stop construction of, affordable housing and low cost childcare for working mothers.

San Francisco workers need programs which focus on bringing new jobs into our city, but Proposition M will drive existing employers out and close the door to new businesses. **Proposition M will be a disaster for working people in San Francisco.**

Vote No on Proposition M.

Bob Barry, President, San Francisco Police Officer's Association
James T. Ferguson, President, San Francisco Fire Fighters #798
Walter L Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leroy King, Regional Director, Int'l. Longshoreman's & Warehouseman's Union
Robert McDonnell, Business Agent, Laborer's Union
Robert Morales, Teamsters Joint Council
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
John J. Moylan, Business Manager, Plaster's and Shop Hands Local #66

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Priority Policies for the Master Plan of the City required by this proposition will take precedent over all other provisions of the Master Plan and will therefore govern all zoning and planning regulations and permits. They will restrict all residential and commercial development throughout the City, not just downtown office development. All eight Priority Policies call for preservation of existing conditions. Therefore ANY new development or improvement projects would be subject to denial or legal challenge to prevent their building.

The City needs both well planned preservation and new development. The City needs new housing and new employment opportunities such as Mission Bay, Rincon Hill and Executive Park. The City needs revitalization of commercial areas as diverse as Stonestown and Third Street. These types of projects could be prevented by the Priority Policies of this proposition.

The Downtown Plan adopted last year is the most effective zoning program for office development in the country. It reduced potential building to deal with possible environmental impacts while still maintaining the opportunity for future employment growth. It is a Plan that balances the City's needs.

The Annual Limit rules of this proposition are so restrictive that few of the benefits from the Downtown Plan's innovative provisions will ever be achieved in our City.

Vote NO on this proposition. It is not needed and its priorities won't meet the future needs of all our citizens.

Toby Rosenblatt, President, City Planning Commission
Bernice M. Hemphill, Member, City Planning Commission
Richard B. Allen, Member, City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M means fewer jobs in minorities communities!

Proposition M claims to be an accountable planning measure, but in reality Proposition M will drastically reduce job opportunities for members of minority communities throughout the City. Proposition M's priority policies will prevent neighborhood business from expanding operations, and job opportunities, into available space, because they may "change existing neighborhood uses"—something expressly forbidden under the measure.

Proposition M will stop new businesses from providing new job opportunities in depressed portions of the City, because new employees commuting to work would "overburden our streets." Ask an unemployed Mission district resident if reducing traffic is more important than creating new jobs in his neighborhood?

Don't be fooled by Proposition M.

The people who wrote Proposition M cleverly added a supposed job training section to make it more attractive to unemployed workers. But, this kind of "sugar coating" will not help if there are no employers to hire newly-trained workers. The critical sections of Proposition M will force employers out of the City!

It seems that anti-growth activists are more concerned with existing uses, square footage ratios and traffic densities than with the lives of real people. Proposition M is bad news for the City's workforce.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Leandro P. Soto, President, The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco
Luisa Ezquerro, Mission Neighborhood Task Force
Carlota del Portillo, Founding Member, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
Manuel Ceballos, Owner, Ceballos Beer Imports Inc.
Eduardo Castillo, Accountant
Peter Rodriguez, Board Member, Mexican Museum Inc.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

If Proposition M passes, it will drastically affect the job prospects and economic well-being of thousands of San Franciscans. In addition, Proposition M will substantially reduce the City's potential tax revenues. Our economy has grown steadily over the last few years and our unemployment level is lower than elsewhere. But Proposition M will jeopardize our future. We don't need and we can't afford Proposition M!

Proposition M Means Fewer Jobs

Passage of Proposition M will send a message to employers that the City does not want to retain current jobs or create new jobs for San Franciscans. The measure specifically states that "existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced." Unfortunately, its language is so contradictory that they could prevent a new neighborhood-serving business from replacing a run-down liquor store, for example, in a changing commercial area. The result: a confusing mess that will require years in court to sort out.

Proposition M Means Lost Revenues

San Francisco businesses currently pay 55 percent of the property taxes in our City and additionally must pay $117 million in gross receipts taxes each year. A large portion of the City services are paid for by these business taxes. If Proposition M passes, new business will be discouraged from locating in San Francisco, the City's tax base will erode and cuts in City services will become inevitable. Homeowners and all city residents will lose.

There is an alternative to Proposition M

The Downtown Plan protects hundreds of historic buildings and allows a small amount of growth to protect the City's economic viability, but stops unnecessary highrises. In addition, it provides funds for open space, MUNI, housing and childcare facilities. Further, the City has area plans and interim zoning controls to protect the character of neighborhood commercial districts and residential areas, without damaging the City's economic base. Proposition M's meat-axe approach would destroy all of this.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Ross Turner, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
James Clarke, President-Elect
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John H. Jacobs, Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M pretends to be accountable planning, but it is really a planning disaster!

City planning is an on-going process which must adapt to changing circumstances. Quality city planning is a time-consuming process which must be subject to careful public review and input. That's why the Downtown Plan and other recent revisions of the planning code have been specifically designed to meet the needs of San Francisco's future and have been closely reviewed by elected officials and the public. Neighborhood organizations and individuals had many opportunities to comment and express their concerns.

Proposition M was drafted in a very short period of time and its supporters hope it will be frozen into law for decades.

The City's Master Plan is designed to improve the quality of life in San Francisco and its policy goals currently include:

- Meeting transportation needs
- Expanding the stock of affordable housing.
- Developing park and open space areas.
- Meeting earthquake safety requirements
- Reducing noise pollution.

Proposition M's priority policies appear reasonable, but are poorly written. They are inconsistent and inflexible and will result in years of costly legal battles. We believe the current process of public hearings works to the benefit of everyone, not just a few.

The Master Plan and the year old Downtown Plan will protect the City's neighborhoods, prevent unnecessary highrise development and maintain the economic diversity and vitality of San Francisco into the next century. We do not need poorly drafted measures like Proposition M.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Shaye Hester, President
Planning Association of the Richmond

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

We the undersigned clergymen do respectfully urge San Francisco voters to reject Proposition M.

This ill-advised measure will result in a 15 year freeze on the revitalization of poor neighborhoods and an exodus of jobs from our City.

We cannot afford Proposition M—Proposition M is economically and socially irresponsible.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Rev. James Leach, President, S.F. Baptist Minister Alliance
Rev. R. L. Owens, Pastor, Mt. Enon Baptist Church
Dr. Hannibal Williams, S.F. President
Interdenominational Ministers Alliance
Rec. Victor L. Medearis, Pastor
Rec. Eugene Lumpkin Jr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

M Planning Initiative

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I feel that Proposition M is an exaggerated and extreme initiative on growth control.

First and foremost, some of the so-called "conservationists", the writers of Proposition M, seem to conveniently forget and openly exclude the survival of poor people in our city. They forget that poor people cannot live on air alone. They forget that poor need housing, food, jobs and clothing. They seem to take a self-righteous position on keeping the environment clean but ignore the pollution of the conditions in our poor communities—rat and roach infestation, filth, inadequate space, and poorly maintained housing facilities.

I challenge the writers of Proposition M to clean up the environment of the poverty, joblessness, and injustice; to help solve some of the problems plaguing the poor so they too may find viable means of remaining, citizens of San Francisco; to look beyond narrow concerns and participate in long term as well as immediate solutions which will empower all the people of our city.

I urge that we allow our present City Master Plan guidelines which already provide strict controls to insure the quality of life in our neighborhoods, to work for all the people of San Francisco.

Rev. Cecil Williams, Minister of Liberation, Glide Church

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will drastically limit the most dynamic sector of San Francisco's economy—small businesses. Small businesses have grown by over 13 percent in the last several years, creating job opportunities for many city residents. However, the restrictive language of **Proposition M will stop small business cold.**

Proposition M's priority policies are so poorly drafted and contradictory that instead of protecting neighborhoods they will actually work to destroy them. In fact, these policies will prevent small businesses from expanding and providing needed jobs even in the City's depressed neighborhoods.

In addition, Proposition M will limit the supply of commercial space citywide and force costs of new space through the roof. This will prevent new firms from locating in San Francisco and creating needed employment opportunities.

The future of our City depends on small businesses. Don't let Proposition M destory our future.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

Hatsuro Aizawa, President, Aizawa Association
Kay Allen, South of Army-Mission Merchant's Association
Richard B. Allen, President, Wine and Cheese Center
Bruce P. Corley, Jr., President, Lakeside Village Merchants Association
Lee S. Dolson, Downtown Association of San Francisco
Ward Donnolly, President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Stanley Eichelbaum, Writer/Restauranteur
H. Welton Flynn, C.P.A.
Ernest L. Go, Bank of the Orient
Naomi Gray, President, Naomi Gray and Assoc.
Demetrio Jayme, Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce
James D. Jefferson, President, Jefferson and Associates Architects
Walter Jebe, Owner, Jebe Camera Shop
George Mattis, President, Merced Manor Property Owners Association
Charles Hall Page, President, Page Anderson and Turnbull
Roy Scola, Past President, Marina Home Owners
Brook Snyder-Spoerry, Owner, Nightbreak Club
Charna E. Staten, Executive Director, Rides for Bay Area Commuters
Peter A. Rothschild, Broker, Rothschild Cappiello
Kenneth Sproul, Managing Partner, The Rubicon Group

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M will be a disaster for the economic foundation of our City. It's another attempt by a small special interest group to impose excessive government restrictions on growth citywide.

Proposition M Will Stop Business Expansion

Proposition M's extreme provisions will reduce the supply of industrial, retail and office space throughout the City. The price of available commercial space will go right through the roof. As price increases and available space decreases, major companies will start a new wave of corporate relocations. Small service oriented businesses will be forced to relocate with their corporate clients or lose massive amounts of business. Business relocations on this scale translate into the loss of massive numbers of City jobs. Further, new businesses of all sizes will be prevented from moving into San Francisco because of the high price of commercial space, making matters even worse.

Proposition M Will Lead To Reductions In City Services

Business taxes in San Francisco provide approximately $117 million to the City's General Fund budget. Proposition M will lead to reductions in City revenues as tax paying businesses move away. If City revenues decline, cuts in important services are certain to follow.

Proposition M Prevents Neighborhood Renovation

Proposition M will create unworkable priority policies for every construction or renovation project in the City. These policies are so poorly constructed they would stop many important neighborhood renovation projects. Proposition M would freeze depressed and deteriorating portions of the City in place—without regard for the needs of the neighborhood.

Proposition M will destroy the economic base of San Francisco, lead to cuts in City services and prevent needed neighborhood renovation projects. This is the kind of measure San Francisco can do without.

Vote No on M

Dorman L. Commons, Business Consultant
Harold S. Dobbs, Attorney
James L. Rudden, Corporate Executive
D.R. Stephens, Chairman & CEO, Bank of San Francisco
Arthur V. Toupin, Vice Chairman of the Board, Retired, Bank of America
Robert P. Whitman, VP Resident Manager, Coldwell Banker
Gordon J. Lau, Attorney

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Planning Initiative M

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the most recent attempt of a small group of people to take control of San Francisco's public planning process. Instead of benefiting from open public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, Proposition M was drafted by a small group of single-minded people. Proposition M is a simplistic and misguided attempt at planning.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M

Marion Aird
Jene Rita Alviar
H. Jesse Arnelle, Attorney
Jerry E. Berg, Attorney
Frederic Campagnoli, Attorney
Youn-Cha S. Chey, Multi-Service Center for Koreans
John Y. Chin
Lily Cuneo
Robert Curran, Commissioner, Rent Board
Paul F. Denning
Keith Eickman, Administrator
Terry A. Francois, President, Frederick Douglas Symposium
Martha M. Gillham, Member, Committee on Elections
Herman L. Griffin, Retired
James C. Hormel
Constance C. Hutchason
David Jenkins, Labor Consultant
Claude Jarman, Corporate Business Consultant
Joan San Jule, Housing Commissioner
Theodore G. Kaplanis, Sons and Daughters of Greece
Toby Levine, Teacher
Mary Martin, Administrative Assistant, S.F. Unified School District
Patrick McGrew
Thomas P. Moore, Past President, Communities Outer Mission Organization
Jeff Mori, Executive Director Japanese Community Youth Council
John C. Morrissey, Attorney
Jacqueline Nemerovski, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jose Ortiz-Olmedo, San Francisco Commission on the Aging
William Paterson, Arts Commissioner
Fred A. Rodriguez, Attorney
Jo Schuman, Commissioner on Status of Women
Felix Warburg, Architect
Lorraine Ramos Wiles
George Yamasaki, Jr., Attorney
Roderick A. McLeod, President Filipino American Democratic Club
Hiawatha Washington, Transit Manager, MUNI
John W. King, Visitacion Valley Senior Escort Program Director
Joannie B. Johnson, President, S.F. Black Leadership Forum
Peter Mezey, Attorney
Caryl Mezey

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Under the guise of "neighborhood power" Proposition M sets up complicated regulations that permit City government to tell us what business and housing developments are acceptable and which are not.

On Potrero Hill we support building communities that will provide jobs for residents and affordable housing. We look forward to the thousands of housing units and blue collar jobs promised by the Mission Bay Development. Proposition M would put all our hopes for progress in limbo. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.

POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M
Arden Smith
Judith Brecka, Attorney
Don Kambic, Teacher

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an effort to freeze the city as it is today. Chinatown began as a restricted ghetto, and today the Chinese community is entering the mainstream of economic and social life in the City. Chinese men and women are now active as architects, engineers and contractors. We want to improve the health and safety of buildings in Chinatown. We want to continue to become part of the City, not a restricted minority. The Downtown Plan is reasonable and fair. PROPOSITION M IS A NEW SET OF RESTRICTIONS THAT WE DO NOT NEED.

Benny Y. Yee, President, Benny Yee and Assoc.
Pius Lee
Joe Ling Jung, President, Lung Kong Assoc.,
Frank Fung, President, Council of Asian American Business Associations
William Lee, Attorney
Landy F. Eng
Rolland Lowe M.D., Physician

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs more housing. The Downtown Plan makes new buildings pay for new housing, and so they have paid over $27 million for housing. Proposition M will practically cut that off.

Bayview/Hunters Point and Third Street need economic development and rehabilitation, and Proposition M gets in the way of a healthy economy and neighborhood revitalization. We want to prosper, but we can't improve our neighborhood if every step of the way has to be cleared by some government agency. Standing still may be the right solution for some neighborhoods, but we want something better than what we've got, and that means changes. PROPOSITION M IS A LOSER AND DESERVES TO BE DEFEATED.

BAYVIEW NEIGHBORS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Muhammed Al Kareem, Publisher, New Bayview Newspaper
Shirley Jones, Executive Director, CAHEED
Arthur H. Coleman M.D., Physician
Thomas N. Galante, Community Leader/Spokesperson
Elouise Westbrook, Retired

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

N Oil Development Moratorium

PROPOSITION N

Shall the City impose a two-year moratorium on permits for development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities within San Francisco?

YES 308 ➡
NO 309 ➡

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Location and operation of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco, including refineries, pipelines and storage tanks, are regulated by the City. Various City agencies issue licenses and permits for the use, development or construction of these crude oil and gas facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years. The City Planning Commission would study the need for permanent controls.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to stop the use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco for the next two years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to regulate crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in San Francisco under existing laws.

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On July 28 an ordinance placing a two year ban on new oil and gas facilities was delivered to the Registrar by four members of the Board of Supervisors with instructions that it be placed on the ballot.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters without using either the initiative or the legislative process.

The July 28 document was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Carol Ruth Silver.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be enacted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION N APPEARS ON PAGE 95

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

Oil Development Moratorium

N

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The development of onshore support facilities for offshore crude oil and gas drilling and production will create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

Potential problems include spills from tankers, pipelines, storage tanks, and refineries; degradation of coastal scenic resources; fouling of water supplies resulting from disposal of toxics; increased emissions of pollutants into the air; and increased noise pollution.

This moratorium on development of onshore support facilities prohibits development of such facilities for two years, during which time the City Planning Commission can study permanent controls for recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco must defend its tourism, fishing, and other industries from being damaged by greedy outside interests. We must keep our living environment clean. Vote Yes on proposition N.

Harry Britt, Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Willie B. Kennedy, Supervisor
Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, Supervisor
Louise H. Renne, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, Supervisor
Doris Ward, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

• Yes on Proposition N.

• Also halt BART environmental and economic mismanagement: The BART Board's recent non-cost effective fare increase lost BART both revenue and ridership. It further increased Bay Area automobile pollution and traffic jams.

San Franciscans for BART Safety

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Jurisdictions are vested in State and Federal.

Martin Eng

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION N

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The development of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities related to oil and gas drilling and production may create unacceptable risks to the quality of life, the environment, and the long-term economic well-being of San Francisco.

(b) Spills of crude oil from tankers, pipelines, refineries, storage facilities and staging areas would have serious environmental and economic consequences, including destruction of marine and avian life; fouling of beaches, estuaries and other bodies of water; degradation of scenic coastal resources; harm to fishing and tourist industries; danger of fire and explosion and creation of noxious odors. These dangers exist because spill containment and cleanup technologies are currently inadequate. Presently, only 5 to 15 percent of spilled oil has been recovered in past cleanup efforts, according to the federal government.

(c) On-shore disposal or storage of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters can result in serious degradation of water quality. These by-products of drilling activities can contain very substantial amounts of toxics, additives, oil and grease, and heavy metals, all of which, when introduced into the environment, cause serious adverse impacts to the health and welfare of the residents of San Francisco.

(d) San Francisco has been declared an air quality non-attainment area by the federal government and is already suffering from the adverse consequences of air pollution. The increased emission of pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, from activities connected with loading, unloading, ballasting, flushing, refining and storage operations would further degrade air quality.

(e) Oil and gas processing and support facilities would create increased levels of noise detrimental to the quality of life in San Francisco.

Section 2. Definitions.

"CRUDE OIL AND GAS PROCESSING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES" means:

(a) REFINERIES: Facilities that process, convert, refine and/or treat crude oil and gas, including facilities that separate crude oil and gas from sea water and dissolved chemicals;

(b) PIPELINES AND PIPELINE FACILITIES: Pipelines, pipeline landfalls and other related methods by which crude oil and gas are transported to crude oil and gas processing and support facilities;

(c) CRUDE OIL TANKER FACILITIES: Facilities, including marine terminals, for the purpose of accommodating the loading or unloading of crude oil and natural gas;

(d) STORAGE FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of storing crude oil and gas, including tank farms, or storing chemicals, drilling muds, cuttings, produced waters and other toxic materials used in the production of

(continued on page 103)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVERMER 4, 1986, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $46,200,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1986, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986, $46,200,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the municiple fire system within the City and County of San Francisco including auxiliary water supply system (high-pressure), motorized gate valves, seismic controls, improvements to pumping stations and tanks, extensions to the high-pressure system, an installation of high-pressure system pressure gauges; the construction of new cisterns in residential areas; the installation of fire pumper suction connections at the San Francisco Bay and at various lakes within San Francisco including the construction of access roads to the lakes; installation of a high-pressure pump station at Lake Merced and the installation of high-pressure loop main in the Sunset District; the construction of an emergency operation center; the preliminary management and environmental review for fire station reconstruction; and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the additions to the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 618-86, $46,200,000;

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 4, 1986, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Progress on or about October 19, 1986.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1986. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $46,200,000 for the improvement of the fire protection system within the City and County of San Francisco."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hold after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 11 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GEORGE AGNOST, City Attorney

By: Robert A. Kenealey
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

6.413 Open Space Acquisition and Park renovation Fund

(a) There is hereby established an open space acquisition and park renovation fund, to be administered by the recreation and park commission. Monies therein shall be appropriated, transferred, expended, or used as provided herein for those recreation and open space purposes determined by the city planning commission to be consistent with the recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan of the city and county and in accordance with the "Recreation and Open Space Programs" to implement the recreation and open space element approved by the city planning commission on July 19, 1973, as from time to time modified by a majority vote of each of the city planning commission and recreation and park commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors. The recreation and open space element of the comprehensive plan and the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", as from time to time modified, shall continue to identify neighborhoods which are in special need of recreation and open space facilities, and shall designate such neighborhoods as "high-need neighborhoods". Monies in the open space acquisition and park renovation fund shall be used to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, eminent domain or otherwise, real property, interests therein, and improvement and development rights thereon and to develop and maintain land so acquired. Lands currently under the jurisdiction on the San Francisco port commission may be acquired by lease or otherwise and may be leased and administered with the funds provided for herein for purposes consistent with this section. The recreation and park commission and the San Francisco port commission are hereby authorized to enter into contracts appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. **Authorization to expend open space monies to maintain properties is intended to include funding the operation of recreation programs.**

(b) There is hereby imposed, pursuant to section 6.400 (a)(3)(d) of this charter, for a period of fifteen (15) years starting with the fiscal year 1975-76, an annual tax of ten cents ($0.10) for each one hundred dollars ($100) assessed valuation to be utilized for the purposes provided for in this section. Revenues obtained thereby shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any sums normally budgeted for the recreation and park commission, and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be deposited into the open space acquistion and park renovation fund. In addition, all grants, gifts, and bequests paid to the city and county for open space acquisition and park renovation, and interest earned thereon, unless otherwise restricted, shall be deposited into the fund. Establishment of this fund is not intended to preclude any other similar programs or any similar use of funds by the city and county. All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer, separate and apart from all other city and county funds, and shall be secured by his or her official bond.

(c) Monies in the fund shall be used for: (i) the acquisition and development of lands within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods", or lands on the the northern waterfront and bay shoreline for recreation purposes; (ii) the acquisition and development of properties within the city and county for open space purposes; and (iii) the renovation of existing parks and recreation facilities within the city and county.

(d) Each year, monies in the fund shall be used to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, private funds, grants, or donations given to the city and county for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to fifteen percent (15%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Each year, monies in the fund shall be used without a matching requirement for the purpose of renovating existing parks and recreational facilities up to an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount of the monies provided for the fund in that year. Monies unspent in either category of this subsection after the end of one fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and shall be used only for the same purposes as they were originally set aside.

The remaining mones shall be used as hereafter indicated in subsection (e).

(e) In each of the first five years of the fund's existence, a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used to acquire real property, and at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for acquisition of properties within or contiguous to "high-need neighborhoods"; the balance of the remainder of the monies in the fund shall be used for administrative expenses and the maintenance and development of properties acquired through the fund.

At any time after the end of five years, the proportion of funds to be used for acquistion as herein set forth may be modified by the board of supervisors. At any time after the end of ten years, if the then-current "Recreation and Open Space Program" no longer shows any lands appropriate for open space and recreation purposes, then the limitation that funds may only be used for the maintanence and development of properties acquired from the fund may be modified in whole or in part by the board of supervisors to provide that funds may be used to expand the maintenance and development of other properties held by the recreation and park department in "high-need neighborhoods" identified in the then current "Recreation and Open Space Programs."

(f) The recreation and park commission and the city planning commission shall hold at least one joint public meeting annually and shall at such time receive and review a report from the general manager of the recreation and park department on the implementation of the "Recreation and Open Space Programs", on expenditures made from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund, and on properties developed in the preceding year for recreation uses. The general manager of the recreation and park department shall also make general recommendations of further lands for acquistion, improvement, or development for approval by a majority of each of the recreation and park commission and the city planning commission meeting jointly, and with the concurrence of the board of supervisors.

(g) Beginning July 1, 1987 monies in the open space fund shall be utilized for open space acquisition, maintenance, renovation and recreation programs on property within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District and the recreation and park commission including property leased by the recreation and park commission from private individuals or public governmental entities. The recreation and park commission shall allocate at least 45 percent of the proceeds on open space acquisition, development of any open space properties acquired and developed pursuant to section 6.413 of this charter and renovation of existing facilities and at lease 12 percent on after school recreation programs.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any funds set aside pursuant to subsection (g) that are unspent or uncommitted at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year and, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the charter, may be appropriated by the board of supervisors for any of the purposes enumerated in section 6.413.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.539-1 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1985

Commencing on July 1, 1987, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1985 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1961. If the member had retired after July 1, 1961, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1986.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1987 or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to July 1, 1987.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: This entire section is new.

8.519 Retirement System Credit for Representative Service

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, any member of the retirement system who is on leave of absence and serving on a full time basis as an employee representative for a recognized employee organization and representing city and county employees on a full time basis, shall have the right to make contributions and obtain service credit with the retirement system subject to the terms of this section.

For purposes of this section, compensation shall mean the remuneration paid in cash, as it may change from time to time, attached to the rank or position held by the member while on leave. For platform employees or coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, compensation shall mean an amount computed by applying the current wage for operators as it may change from time to time, to a time factor measured by the average time paid on the two highest paid runs in the municipal railway from time to time.

There shall be no cost to the city and county for representative service. The member shall be responsible for transmittal of all contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the member and the city and county. No service credit will be allowed unless and until all contributions are received by the retirement system. The organization may agree to pay the employer contributions which would ordinarily be paid by the city and county. The member shall pay the member contributions. If the organization does not pay the employer contributions the member must pay those contributions in order to obtain representative service credit.

A member may receive credit for prior representative service, at no cost to the city and county pursuant to the preceding paragraph, when agreed by the member and the organization.

The retirement board shall have the authority to establish procedures to calculate compensation and collect contributions plus interest for representative service. The calculation of compensation herein may also be used in determining average final compensation in computing the member's retirement allowance.

This section shall be effective November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to retirement system members or their successors in interest who retired or terminated prior to November 4, 1986. This section shall not apply to representative service prior to a member's effective date of membership with the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: This section is new.

8.407-1 Compensation adjustments.

The civil service commission, for employees whose salaries are fixed pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, shall conduct a pay equity survey comparing city and county classifications disproportionately occupied by minorities and women and city and county classifications not disproportionately occupied by minorities and women. Such survey shall be conducted in accordance with standards and guidelines of similar surveys in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment and make use of relevant survey data obtained from such entities. The civil service commission shall complete said survey and transmit it to the mayor and the board of supervisors on or before February 1, 1987 and shall update said survey on or before February 1 of each year thereafter.

The board of supervisors may make upward pay equity adjustments to the basic rates of pay recommended by the civil service commission pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407, provided that said adjustments shall not exceed the pay equity differentials identified by the civil service commission in its survey required under this section and provided further that any such adjustments may be vetoed in whole or in part by the Mayor, subject to the provisions of section 2.303.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold faced type;** deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to police officers or patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the

budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15) per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firefighter classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c)(1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest

average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, or firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any other charter provision, the rates of compensation for police officers and firefighters shall be annually further increased as follows:

(1) In the event that any city of 350,000 population or over in the State of California as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section has not finalized, fixed, or reached agreement as to the rates of compensation prior to the 25th day of August, the date for further and additional fixing of the rates of compensation and for further and additional amending of the annual appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance to provide for the paying of additional rates of compensation to police officers and firefighters shall extend to the 30th day of June of the following year.

(2) Should any city as defined in subsections (a) and (c) of this section finalize, fix or reach agreement as to the rates of compensation after the 25th day of August but prior to the 30th day of June of the following year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, by ordinance, within 30 calendar days of said finalizing, fixing, or reaching agreement, further to fix the rates of compensation for the uniformed members of the police and fire departments and to further amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include provisions for paying the rates of compensation as so further fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of this section, and said rate of compensation shall be effective retroactive to the effective date of the agreement or legislation designated in subsections (a) and (c), but in no event prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) This amendment shall become effective immediately upon certification of election results and its provisions shall pertain to fixing rates of pay for police officers and firefighters during fiscal year 1986-87.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.320 Qualifications of Applicants

(a) Any person having the qualifications prescribed by section 8.100 of this charter may submit himself **or herself** for any examination under conditions established by the civil service commission. ~~Provided, however, applicants for positions as motorman, conductor or bus operator on the municipal railway need not be residents of the city and county at the time of application, examination or appointment but must become residents within the meaning of Section 8.100 within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, after completion of the probationary period provided in Section 8.340.~~

(b) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the fire department shall not be less than 19 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 20 years of age or ~~more than 32 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(c) Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than 20 years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than 21 years of age ~~or more than 35 years of age~~ at the time of appointment. ~~and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in any of the armed forces of the United States.~~

(d) The commission shall advertise and may take further appropriate means to interest suitable applicants. When examinations for promotion are to be held, the commission shall give notice thereof to all persons in positions entitling them under the civil service rules, to participate in such examination, by posting information thereof in the office of the commission for a period of ten days and notifying the office, agency, or department concerned.

~~8.320.1 Qualifications of Applicants for H2 Fireman from List E-25~~

~~Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8.320 of the charter, any applicant who has successfully completed the examination procedures for the entrance position Class H2, Fireman, and who would otherwise be eligible for appointment from list E-25 adopted December 18, 1973, shall continue to be eligible for appointment for the duration of list E-25, Class H2, Fireman, even though such applicant is more than 32 years of age at the time of appointment.~~

8.559-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.559-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retire-

ment allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.559-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.559-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.559-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.585-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.585-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty-five percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, plus an allowance at the rate of four percent of said final compensation, for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy-five percent of said member's final compensation. A member retired after attaining the age of sixty-five years, but, before completing twenty-five years of service in the aggregate computed under section 8.585-10, shall receive a retirement allowance which bears the same ratio to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.585-1, as the service with which he **or she** is entitled to be credited, bears to twenty-five years. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement from disability resulting from an injury received in performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.585-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.586-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.586-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.586-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no ~~wife~~ **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.586-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.588-2 Service Retirement

Any member of the fire department who completes at least twenty-five years of service in the aggregate and attains the age of fifty years, said service to be computed under section 8.588-10, may retire for service at his **or her** option. ~~Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years.~~ A member retired after meeting the service and age requirements in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to fifty percent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.588-1, plus an allowance at the rate of three percent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty-five years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy percent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability, resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no wife **spouse**, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.588-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his **or her** allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser allowance to be received by him **or her** throughout his **or her** life, and partly in other benefits payable after his **or her** death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar election by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face** type; deletions are indicated by ~~line-through~~ type.

8.300 Civil Service Positions

(a) All positions in all departments and offices of the city and county, including positions created by laws of the State of California, where the compensation is paid by the city and county, shall be included in the classified civil service of the city and county, and shall be filled from lists of eligibles prepared by the civil service commission, excepting:

(1) Positions in which attorneys and physicians are employed in their professional capacity to perform only duties included in their professions, but exclusive of any administrative or executive positions for which such professional status constitutes only part of the qualification therefor;

(2) All employees of the San Francisco Unified School District who serve in the capacity of paraprofessionals and technical instructional assis-

tants employed by the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that presently employed persons be granted status and those who are on existing eligibility lists as of December 31, 1973 be granted status rights to appointment in rank order;

(3) Inmate help or student nurses, or part-time services, where the compensation including the value of any allowances in addition thereto does not exceed one hundred fifty dollars ($150) per month. Provided that for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1963, the civil service commission shall adjust the one hundred fifty dollars ($150) maximum for part-time service as provided herein, in accordance with the average percentage increase or decrease approved for all classifications under the provisions of sections 8.400 and 8.401 of this charter, and such adjusted rate shall be included in the annual salary ordinance. Provided further that such part-time positions shall not be exempted from being filled from appropriate lists of civil service eligibles, except upon the recommendation of the appointing officer, who shall set forth the schedule of operations showing that the operations involved require the service of employees for not more than seventy (70) hours per month and approval of the civil service commission, including a certification that such part-time positions cannot practically be filled from existing eligible lists. These provisions shall not be used to split or divide any position into two or more units for the purpose of evading the provisions of this section;

(4) Persons employed in positions outside the city and county upon construction work being performed by the city and county when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service by an order of the civil service commission;

(5) Persons employed in positions in any department for expert professional temporary services, and when such positions are exempted from said classified civil service for a specified period of said temporary service, by order of the civil service commission;

(6) Entry level positions designated by an appointing officer with approval of the civil service commission for persons who meet minimum qualifications and are certified as severely disabled. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, persons appointed to such exempt positions under this subsection, and whose job performance is certified as satisfactory by their appointing officer, and who remain in said exempt position for one year, shall acquire civil service status. The civil service commission shall adopt rules and regulations to enforce and implement this subsection which shall include performance evaluation requirements, definition of and standards for the certification of the severely disabled;

(7) Persons employed as curators by any department of the city and county whose primary function is the collection or exhibition of art;

(8) Persons employed as curators by any department whose primary function is not the collection or exhibition of art will require certification of qualification by the Director of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco;

~~(7)~~ **(9)** Such positions as, by other provisions in this charter, are specifically exempted from, or where the appointment is designated as exclusive of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

The civil service rights, acquired by persons under the provisions of the charter superseded by this charter, shall continue under this charter.

Any person holding a salaried office under the city and county, whether by election or appointment, who shall, during his term of office, hold or retain any other salaried office under the government of the United States, or of this state, or who shall hold any other salaried office connected with the government of the city and county, or who shall become a member of the legislature, shall be deemed to have thereby vacated the office held by him under the city and county.

(b) Positions as heads of offices, agencies, departments, bureaus, or institutions shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter unless specifically exempted.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city and county shall perform all acts necessary to protect the employment rights of employees of the port authority as specified in Section 20 of Statutes 1968, ch. 1333.

(d) All positions in buildings and improvements of the California Academy of Sciences for which funds shall be furnished by the city and county, under section 6.404(d) of this charter, shall be held by employees of the city and county, with the exception of the director, the secretary of the board of trustees of said California Academy of Sciences, the curators and other scientific and professional personnel, and occupants of part-time positions for which a total compensation of less than $80 per month is provided by the city and county, inclusive of allowance for maintenance and other incidental benefits. Positions held by employees of the city and county at said buildings and improvements shall be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensation thereof shall be subject to the salary standardization provisions of this charter, in like manner and extent in all respects as positions and compensations of employments in the city and county service generally, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the charter or ordinances of said city and county. The chief administrative officer shall be the appointing officer as provided in this charter.

(e) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by lease or under any other temporary arrangement, under which the city acquires the right to operate said utility, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions under, and entitled to all, the benefits of the civil service provisions of this charter for the period of time during which the city shall continue to operate said utility under said lease or other temporary arrangement. Should the city permanently acquire said utility, said persons shall come into the permanent employ of the city and county in their respective positions and shall be deemed permanently appointed thereto under the civil service provisions of the charter and shall be entitled to all the benefits thereof, all subject to the provisions contained in sections 8.300(f) and 8.450 of the charter; provided, however, that said employees who are taken over into the employ of the city under said lease or other temporary arrangement shall not be subject to the residential qualifications of the charter, during the term of said lease or other temporary arrangement. All employees of any such utility, acquired or operated by the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement, who come into the employ of said utility after the temporary acquisition of same, shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The civil service rights of any person who comes into the service of the city under any lease or other temporary arrangement for the acquisition and operation of said utility shall cease and terminate upon the expiration of said lease or other temporary arrangement.

(f) All persons employed in the operating service of any public utility hereafter acquired by the city and county, at the time the same is taken over by the city and county, and who shall have been so employed for at least one year prior to the date of such acquisition, shall be continued in their respective positions and shall be deemed appointed to such positions, under, and entitled to all the benefits of, the civil service provisions of this charter.

(g) All employees engaged in public utility work at the time this charter shall go into effect, and who have been permanently appointed to their respective positions in conformity with the civil service provisions of this charter, shall except as otherwise provided by this charter become employees of the public utilities commission under the classification held by each such employee at such time.

(h) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to the airport department under the public utilities commission immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as an appointee of the airport department, provided that civil service rights as they relate to layoff in the event of lack of work or lack of funds of all permanent employees of the public utilities commission, including the airport department, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall be continued without loss in the same manner and to the same extent as though the airport department had not by these amendments been created a separate city function under the airports commission.

(i) Any employee who was a permanent civil service appointee assigned to an exposition auditorium and whose job function is placed under the Convention Facilities Management Department shall be continued without loss in civil service rights as though said job functions had not by amendment to this charter been placed under the jurisdiction of the chief administrative officer, and shall not lose those civil service rights which relate to layoff from a permanent civil service position in the event of lack of work or lack of funds.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

PROPOSITION M (Continued)

reconsidered by any agency pursuant to a Court decision. This process shall continue until the Department is able to certify that all projects with approval dates on or before November 4, 1986 have received permits, have been abandoned or are no longer subject to litigation challenging their approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of the City Planning Code or the former provisions of Subsection 320(g), all projects in excess of 24,999 square feet of additional office space shall be included in the survey. The list shall not include permits for projects authorized pursuant to the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322.

(c) Not later than February 1, 1987, and February 1 of each subsequent year as set out above, the Department shall certify in writing to the City Planning Commission at a public hearing the list of all projects enumerated in subsection (b) above, including the square footage of each project and the total of all such projects.

(d) Within 30 days of receipt of the Department's certification, the Commission shall reduce the 950,000 square foot annual limit established in Subsection 321(a)(1) by 475,000 square feet per approval period until the amount of square footage remaining on the Department's list is reduced to zero.

(e) If the City has authorized more than 475,000 square feet as part of the office development competition set out in Subsection 321(b) and Section 322 prior to November 4, 1986, any amount exceeding 475,000 square feet shall be separately deducted from otherwise allowable square feet calculated pursuant to subsection (d) above for the approval period and for subsequent approval periods until the total amount of square footage is reduced to zero.

Section 321.2 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.2. LEGISLATIVE REDUCTION OF ANNUAL LIMIT.

(g) The Board of Supervisors is permitted to reduce the annual limit defined in Subsection 321(a)(1).

Section 321.3 is added as follows:

SECTION 321.3. VOTER APPROVAL OF EXEMPTION OF OFFICE PROJECTS AUTHORIZED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

Any office development approved pursuant to a development agreement under Government Code Section 65865 or any successor section may only be exempted from the annual limit set forth in Subsection 321(a)(1) after the exemption for such office development has been approved by the voters at a regularly scheduled election.

Section 325 is amended as follows:

SECTION 325. SUNSET CLAUSE.

The limit on office development set out in Planning Code sections 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324 as of October 17, 1985, as amended by the voters on November 4, 1986, shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by the voters of San Francisco at a regularly scheduled election.

PART 3—EMPLOYMENT

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that Part II, Chapter II, of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended as follows:

Subsection 164(a) is amended as follows:

SECTION 164. SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT PLACEMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

(a) The City has determined in its certification of the Downtown Plan Environmental Impact Report and in its findings and studies leading to the adoption of Section 313 of the Planning Code that San Francisco and regional traffic and transit problems will become more intolerable as the number of non-resident employees increases in San Francisco as a result of new office development. In order to mitigate those adverse traffic and transit impacts, while protecting the City's residential areas from unwanted increases in density, the people determine that a policy of maximizing resident employment training and placement opportunities is needed.

Subsections 164(d) and (e) are added as follows:

(d) In order to ensure that the maximum number of San Francisco residents are trained and placed in employment opportunities in our City, the Board of Supervisors shall hold public hearings and not later than January 1, 1988 the City shall adopt legislation to establish a program which will coordinate the job training and placement efforts of the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Community College District, community-based non-profit employment and training programs, and other agencies from the public and private sectors, to assure maximum use of existing federal, state and local training and placement programs, and to develop such additional training and placement programs as deemed necessary.

(e) Should the Board of Supervisors determine that additional funds are needed for programs established pursuant to subsection (d) above, it shall consider the adoption of a San Francisco Resident Training and Placement Fee of not less than $1.50 per square foot as a condition of the approval of any application for an office development project proposing the net addition of 50,000 or more gross square feet of office space.

PART 4—SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

If any part of this initiative is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part or application hereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

PROPOSITION N (Continued)

oil and gas products;

(e) STAGING AREAS: Facilities, yards and other areas designated for the purpose of transporting equipment to be used in or personnel employed in the construction or operation of oil drilling facilities;

(f) WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES: Facilities for the purpose of disposing of drilling muds, cuttings and produced waters generated in the course of drilling oil and gas wells.

Section 3. Duration of Moratorium.

The moratorium set forth herein shall expire at the end of two (2) years after the effective date of this ordinance unless extended by further action of the Board of Supervisors.

Section 4. Conditions of Moratorium; Penalty.

(a) No permit or license shall be granted for any use, development or construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(b) The use, development or construction of any facility for the purposes defined in Section 2 shall be prohibited for the duration of this ordinance.

(c) The City and County of San Francisco may commence an action to enjoin any actual or threatened use, development or construction of any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance.

(d) Any person using, developing or constructing any crude oil and gas processing and support facilities in violation of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500) or six (6) months in jail, or both. Each use, development or construction of such facilities in violation of this ordinance shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

Section 5. Planning Commission Study.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall study the need for permanent and comprehensive controls and shall prepare prohibitory legislation for the Board of Supervisors to consider before the expiration of this ordinance or any duly enacted extension.

(b) Specifically, the City Planning Commission shall determine the following:

(1) The social, economic and physical impact of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

(2) The necessity for the absolute prohibition of the use, development and construction of crude oil and gas processing and support facilities.

Section 6. Severability.

If any provision or clause of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other chapter provisions, and clauses of this chapter are declared to be severable.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
554-4399

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

BALLOT TYPE

012

19th Assembly District
No State Senate Race
5th Congressional District
No BART Race

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
9700's

Application for Absentee Ballot

is enclosed in this pamphlet (see card insert)

In the event that the absentee ballot application card is not enclosed or becomes lost, simply sign your name and address on this page, write "Please send me an absentee ballot," tear off the page and mail it to the Registrar at the above address.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 AM to 8 PM

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.