

at least eight percent (8%) of the number of persons eligible to vote at the general municipal election next preceding the filing of the petition.

(c) **RECALL OF THE MAYOR.** To initiate proceedings for the exercise of the power of recall of the Mayor, the petition shall be signed by duly qualified electors of the City equal in number to at least twelve percent (12%) of the number of persons eligible to vote at the general municipal election next preceding the filing of the petition.

(d) **RECALL OF COUNCIL MEMBER.** To initiate proceedings for the exercise of the power of recall of a Council member elected by a District, the petition shall be signed by duly qualified electors of the District equal in number to at least twelve percent (12%) of the number of persons residing in the District eligible to vote at the general municipal election next preceding the filing of the petition.

CITY ATTORNEY'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRICT CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

The present Charter provides for a seven member council, one of whom is the Mayor. All members, including the Mayor, are elected at large for regular terms of four years. The terms are staggered. The proposed amendment will increase the membership of the Council to eleven members, one of whom will be the Mayor. This increase will commence on January 1, 1981. The City will be divided into ten numbered districts which shall be as nearly equal in population as practicable, and their boundaries will be altered for this purpose following each Federal Decennial Census. The Mayor may reside anywhere in the City and will be nominated and elected at large. Each of the other ten members will be nominated and elected by one of the ten numbered districts alone and must reside in that district. The amendment provides that the terms of all members of the present seven member Council, except the Mayor, will expire on December 31, 1980. The Mayor's term will continue through this December 31, 1982, and that portion of the Mayor's term on and after January 1, 1981, will be as a member of the eleven member Council. General municipal elections will continue to be held on each even-numbered year. The first elections under the amendment will be in 1980, and at these 1980 elections all seats on the eleven member Council, except that of the Mayor, shall be filled for a term commencing on January 1, 1981. In order to stagger the terms, the terms of five of the ten members elected in 1980 shall be for two years ending December 31, 1982, and the terms of the other five members shall be regular four year terms ending December 31, 1984. At its first meeting in January, 1981, the eleven member Council shall determine by lot whether the five members elected by the even-numbered districts or the five elected by the odd-numbered districts shall hold office for the two year terms expiring December 31, 1982. Those whose terms are determined not to end on December 31, 1982 shall hold office for regular terms of four years ending December 31, 1984. At the elections held in 1982 the seat of the Mayor and the seats of the five members of the Council whose terms expire on December 31, 1982 will be filled for regular terms of four years commencing on January 1, 1983. Thereafter, seats on the Council, including that of the Mayor, will be filled for regular terms of four years. Regular terms shall commence on the first day of January next following, and end on the last day of December in the fourth year succeeding, the year of the election. Members elected by a district will be subject to recall only by that district.

ROBERT J. LOGAN
City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE F

Under the present City Charter, each member of the City Council is expected to represent an entire city of 580,000 people. Candidates must spend enormous sums of money to be elected, money which normally is available only from large contributors. Average citizens have little access to their representatives; they can only feel anger and frustration when their pressing needs and concerns are ignored.

Passage of Measure F will assure responsive and accountable government in San Jose by requiring the election of all Council members except the Mayor from neighborhood districts. IN IMPORTANT AREAS SUCH AS LAND USE, PUBLIC SAFETY AND CITY SERVICES, REPRESENTATIVES WILL HAVE TO LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE WHO ELECT THEM. Access to money will not be the major qualification for public office; candidates who have lived, worked and developed strong ties in their districts will be able to defeat those candidates whose only asset is an expensive media campaign. Neighborhood associations and other community groups which have been ignored in the past will finally have direct representation at City Hall.

Don't be misled by claims that creating ten Council districts will result in large increases in government costs. City Hall presently can accommodate eleven Council members. The City Clerk's office has officially estimated the cost of district elections at \$200,000 per year — LESS THAN 1/10 OF 1% OF SAN JOSE'S \$246,000,000 CITY BUDGET. Accountable representation will cost far less than the city routinely spends on consultants and other costly services for special interests. THE BEST WAY TO CUT COSTS IS TO INSURE THE ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES WHO LISTEN.

WE URGE YOU TO JOIN US IN VOTING YES ON DISTRICT ELECTIONS BY VOTING YES ON MEASURE F.

Ellie Tershy, Member, Berryessa Citizens Advisory Council.
Dorothy Silva, President, Hampton Foothills Homeowners Association.
Rev. Ricardo J. Garcia, Co-Director, Centro Pastoral, San Jose
Iola M. Williams, School Board Member; Member, Charter Review Committee, City of San Jose.
Richard R. Conway, Business Representative, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO Local 332; Member, Charter Review Committee, City of San Jose.

The undersigned authors of the primary argument in favor of ballot measure F at the general municipal election for the City of San Jose to be held on November 7, 1978, hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the best of their knowledge and belief.

Signed: Dorothy D. Silva, Ellie Tershy, Rev. Ricardo Garcia, Richard R. Conway, Iola M. Williams.
Date: Aug. 29, 1978.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE F

A "no" vote is urged on this proposition for the following reasons:

(1) Districts fragment the City causing each Council member to be concerned primarily with special interests of one's District, thereby promoting an intensive competition amongst Councilpersons. To be effective the Councilperson representing a District must have the support of other Councilpersons, but a Councilperson representing a District would be less concerned with the problems of any other District. There has been an intensive and undesirable inner competition amongst our present Councilmembers. The unfortunate consequences of this condition have been felt by all. Districting will encourage this inner competition resulting in chaos and indecisiveness.

(2) A voter should have a voice in electing all of the Councilpersons, each of whom should represent and be responsible to all of the people of San Jose. The voter now has 100% of vote control. Under Districting this full control is reduced to 18% or two out of eleven Councilpersons, that is, each Councilperson would be elected from one of ten specific Districts and the Mayor elected at large.

(3) The proposal will increase the size and cost of government, rather than reduce it. Instead of having seven Councilpersons, the proposal increases this membership to eleven, thereby requiring more aides, staff, secretaries, etc.

(4) Districts (wards) are conducive to bossism.

(5) It is claimed that Districting will bring government closer to the people. At present seven Councilpersons represent approximately 600,000 people or a ratio of 1 to 85,000. Under the District proposal the ratio would be 1 to 60,000. Can one person serve 60,000 more effectively than 85,000? This appears to be a theoretical concept. The electorate should strive toward a well-balanced community with economic and environmental benefits for all—a unified City which can then be called "our City" rather than "Our District."

Signed: Michael H. Antonacci.

The undersigned author of the primary argument against ballot proposition F at the general municipal election for the City of San Jose to be held on November 7, 1978, hereby states that such argument is true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Signed: Michael H. Antonacci. Date: 9/8/78.

Candidates' Statements

MAYOR

ALFREDO GARZA, JR. Age: 41. Occupation: City Councilman. Education and qualifications: Al Garza has the qualities of leadership and intelligence we need to solve the problems of San Jose. As an educator, administrator, and public official, Al Garza has demonstrated an ability to listen to all the people, not simply those with the money and influence to force their demands on City Hall. San Jose is a place where people live

and work. Because of this, Al Garza is determined that our neighborhoods throughout the city should receive the highest priority in the allocation of public money. The passage of Proposition 13 was a clear message from the voters that tax revenues should be used to benefit the people who live here, not to support an unwieldy and unproductive government bureaucracy. At present, decisions which will irrevocably affect our economic and environmental future are being delegated to staff who are not elected by the voters and who are not responsive to the public needs. Al Garza wants to return control of our City to the homeowners and taxpayers who live here. He is committed to being a full-time mayor who will listen to all the voters and provide the leadership we need to make our city government effective.

JANET GRAY HAYES. Age: 52. Occupation: Mayor. Education and Qualifications: Rarely have voters had so clear a choice between candidates for Mayor. Never has that choice been so important to this city's future.

Growth: Mayor Janet Gray Hayes is known nationally for beginning to control San Jose's runaway growth. Councilman Alfredo Garza has spent seven years on the Council voting for development of Coyote Valley, hillsides and encouraging urban sprawl. Over Mayor Hayes' objections, he fired the controlled-growth city manager who dared to question him.

Taxes/Spending: Last year, despite Councilman Garza's loud objections, Mayor Hayes cut city spending by \$5 million. This year, Councilman Garza forced a major new tax on San Jose and called it a "responsible" budget program.

Open Government: Mayor Hayes asked that Councilman Garza's new tax be put to the people for a vote. He refused. Then Councilman Garza pushed through a \$25 million spending program at midnight and voted to deny public input. Mayor Hayes' objections went unheeded.

Leadership: If leadership means ramrodding through major programs at midnight without public discussion, raising taxes without your consent, or firing an outstanding city manager who dares to question, then vote for Councilman Garza. But if leadership means "letting the people decide," then re-elect Mayor Hayes.

COUNCIL MEMBER, SEAT NO. 2

JERRY ESTRUTH. Age: 35. Occupation: Investment Broker. Education and qualifications: Born, raised and educated in San Jose, then Stanford University. Worked five years in South America for the Peace Corps — two as Regional Administrative Director. Since 1969, worked for a San Jose investment brokerage firm. Lives in the home his grandfather built near downtown San Jose.

San Jose stands at a cross roads. The choice is simple: unregulated growth and Urban Sprawl, versus Balanced Growth San Jose can afford. On election day, you, the voter, must decide. Uncontrolled growth — the Incumbent's choice — is expensive. If these expenses aren't met, either spending goes up or services will be reduced and we drift toward municipal bankruptcy. Balanced growth — Jerry's choice — requires a responsible look at economic and human consequences, (neighborhoods, labor, business, environment).

Six months ago, three other council members joined Colla to form a "Ruling Majority" supporting Joe's "sprawl" policies. Since then, they voted through a series of hasty, expensive, and divisive actions — including new taxes and firing the City Manager. Colla claims he wants to cut costs and improve government efficiency. Talk is cheap; wrong decisions are very expensive. The city can't afford any more of Mr. Colla's actions. Jerry Estruth will provide the economic common sense we urgently need.

JOSEPH A. COLLA. Occupation: Registered Pharmacist/Businessman. Education and qualifications: I am noted for my POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE and for my REFUSAL to spend YOUR TAX DOLLARS on unplanned, often unnecessary programs.

I have asked for adequate POLICE and FIRE protection.

I have fought for SAFE and DRIVABLE roads.

I have demanded that your neighborhoods receive the BASIC SERVICES vital to your health and safety.

I have continually demanded that the intent of Proposition 13 be met with CUTS IN SPENDING — government CANNOT and MUST NOT continue to SPEND FOR THE SAKE OF SPENDING.

I have spent less of YOUR TAX DOLLARS than anyone on the City Council.

I DO NOT have a FREE CITY CAR or a BIG STAFF.

I DO NOT take FREE CITY TRIPS.

I DO NOT seek the endorsement of special interest groups or individuals who are looking for political power.

Our City government cannot continue to function as a CIRCUS, with a new act appearing each week.

I am a practical BUSINESSMAN. I have brought SOUND JUDGMENT and LOGICAL VIEWS to local government.

I demand more ACCOUNTABILITY from City Hall and more CREDIBILITY from our City Council.

I ask for your vote on Tuesday, November 7.