

G

Election of Supervisors — District Elections

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Vote Yes on Proposition G.

DISTRICT ELECTIONS WILL REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTIONS:

The cost of running for office in San Francisco has increased dramatically over the last 15 years. In 1994, candidates for the Board of Supervisors had to spend an average of \$318,000 in citywide campaigns to be elected.

DISTRICT ELECTIONS WILL INCREASE NEIGHBORHOOD REPRESENTATION AND COOPERATION:

If you want Supervisors who reflect the rich diversity of San Francisco's neighborhoods and will work toward building unity among all our communities, support district elections.

DISTRICT ELECTIONS WILL MAKE ELECTED OFFICIALS MORE ACCOUNTABLE:

Citywide supervisors have to be accountable to their contributors, not to an identifiable district constituency of voters. District supervisors will *have a better understanding of neighborhood issues*. If you want supervisors *more* accountable to your *individual* concerns, support district elections.

DISTRICT ELECTIONS WILL HELP DEMOCRATIZE SAN FRANCISCO POLITICS:

For supervisors who will work for you on your problems, on the needs of your neighborhood and community, and in the interests of your City — support district elections.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Vote No on Proposition G

District Elections will *not* reduce the cost of elections — read the ordinance. There is *nothing* in it that affects the cost. In fact, you can spend more money in a smaller district further disenfranchising working people and communities of color.

District Elections will divide San Francisco into eleven competing districts, encouraging horsetrading and dealmaking further dividing communities rather than working together as a whole on behalf of all of San Francisco — every neighborhood!

Citywide elections have created a new dynamic in San Francisco in the 1990s. When we work as a coalition, we can not only elect a majority citywide but we have defeated incumbents who are out of touch with our diverse neighborhoods and communities.

Citywide elections have produced important progressive leaders like Mayor Willie Brown, Assemblywoman Carole Migden, Board

of Supervisors President Kevin Shelley, Supervisors Mabel Teng and Susan Leal.

We are one city — united in our celebration of cultural diversity, forward thinking, compassionate, tolerant and thoughtful. Let's not react like small-minded conservatives out of touch with the liberal traditions of our city. They seek to fool us into believing districts are progressive — **THEY ARE REGRESSIVE**, a step backward to troubled times in our city when deep divisions created one of the worst tragedies in San Francisco's history.

Send a strong message that you cherish a united San Francisco.

Vote No on Dividing San Francisco into eleven competing districts — VOTE NO ON G.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

Election of Supervisors — District Elections



OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

District Elections made sense in the mid 1970s. In fact, we supported it then. However, in 1996, it's a foolish step backwards. Our organization backed it in the 1970s because we needed to elect leaders like Harvey Milk who would unify progressive San Franciscans. But now that we have matured, our community and our coalition has grown citywide, and we believe district elections is divisive in 1996.

San Francisco is a united city of diverse neighborhoods, and we are all proud of that diversity. We are a generous, astute and involved city that cares passionately about our communities, our neighborhoods, and the issues of the day.

District Elections will hurt groups that are geographically dispersed, such as Gays/Lesbians, Asians and Pacific Islanders, Hispanics, and African Americans, by making them a minority in every district. The city-wide voting power of these groups will be eliminated under District Elections, probably resulting in fewer minorities on the Board. We do not consider this to be "progressive."

We currently have the most diverse and progressive Board of Supervisors in our City's history; further, we have a diverse group of candidates running for the Board this November. So why divide our City into eleven competing districts?

You, the citizen will go from having eleven Supervisors you can talk with, to just one. Don't be fooled by well-meaning "progressives" who seek change for change's sake — the San Francisco Republican Party has made support for District Elections its top priority this November. They want to elect a more conservative Board. San Francisco Supervisors Susan Leal, Mabel Teng, Amos Brown & Barbara Kaufman voted against putting district elections on the ballot. District elections will divided a united city. **Don't fall into a divisive Republican trap — Join us in voting NO on District Elections.**

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Election reform opponents want you to believe that districts are a "divisive Republican trap" — but they don't mention that Proposition G is endorsed by the San Francisco Democratic Party.

Contrary to opponents' misleading claims, district elections will actually empower members of our ethnic communities, encourage coalition building, and give our diverse neighborhoods their own voice in City government. The truth is that district elections *introduced* ethnic diversity and gay representation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Since the repeal of districts, only one supervisor representing an ethnic community has ever been elected without first being elected under district elections or appointed by a mayor.

Politics in the 1990's is almost exclusively about money. District elections will dramatically reduce the cost of campaigning — and the influence of special interests — because candidates will

build neighborhood support instead of relying on expensive city-wide political mail campaigns. Candidates will actually walk their districts, talking to residents and business managers about local concerns like MUNI service, proposed construction of an unwanted chain store, crime in a neighborhood park, etc.

District elections offer a clear choice compared to our current system: neighborhood candidates directly accountable to voters about local concerns as opposed to the status quo — expensive, impersonal campaigns dominated by flashy political junk mail. Let's reduce the role of money and big contributors in local politics. Please join the San Francisco Democratic Party and the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters in voting yes on Proposition G.

Board of Supervisors

G

Election of Supervisors — District Elections

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge a YES vote of Proposition G.

District Election of Supervisors will give San Franciscans direct accountability over their Supervisors. It will reduce, dramatically, the cost of campaigning. Neighborhood Supervisors must address issues of concern to residents of the City's neighborhoods — not the interests of a few wealthy contributors. In three years under District Elections from 1970 through 1980 rent control was passed, commercial developers were charged for MUNI service, and the most extensive neighborhood rezoning in the City's history, protecting affordable housing and historic buildings, was passed. District Election of Supervisors places the needs of residents and small business from all parts of San Francisco, at the center of public policy. It fosters coalitions between our diverse neighborhoods, producing good legislation and good policy.

I strongly urge a YES vote of Prop G.

Supervisor Sue Bierman

No candidate from a minority community has ever been elected to the Board under the current at-large system without first having been appointed to the Board by a Mayor or having held another office.

Currently, many neighborhoods are not adequately represented on the Board, including the Excelsior, Sunset, the Mission, and Bayview Hunters Point.

To get elected under the current system, candidates must conduct expensive direct mail campaigns and buy onto slate cards controlled by the political machine, consultants, and special interests.

The current system makes members of the Board accountable to the Mayor and the power-brokers, not to the voters.

District elections would empower minorities and the neighborhoods from the grassroots, reduce the costs of getting elected, and would return accountability to the voters.

Vote Yes on Proposition G.

Manuel A. (Manny) Rosales

Candidate for the Board of Supervisors

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Committee to elect Manny Rosales for Supervisor.

As members of the Elections Task Force, we strongly urge you to reject the status quo and support District Elections, Proposition G.

We were appointed by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and the Registrar of Voters to examine the current system and alternative systems of electing members to the Board, and other related issues.

After meeting weekly for eleven months in 1995 and holding eighteen public hearings throughout the City, we concluded that the current method of electing Supervisors was fatally flawed and that any of four alternative systems would be an improvement.

Two alternatives appear on the ballot.

We contracted with the Public Research Institute at San Francisco State to draft district maps based on strict criteria, and we revised the drafts several times based on public input. The Board of Supervisors had no say in the drawing of the lines, eliminating any possibility of a Conflict of Interest.

This July, the Board voted 7 to 4 to approve our District Election plan, which appears as Proposition G.

We believe that we remedied all the flaws of the District Elections plan of twenty years ago, and that the new plan will create a very diverse Board, will reduce the costs of running for office, and will make each member accountable to the voters and each neighborhoods.

Vote Yes on Proposition G

Members of the Elections Task Force

Gwenn Craig

Henry Louie

Chris Bowman

Susan Horsfall

Eric Mar

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Elections Task Force Members.

VOTE YES on Proposition G.

Elect Supervisors who live in and know your neighborhood. Know who to contact at City Hall to get action. Stop the influence of special interests.

VOTE YES on Proposition G,

San Francisco Tomorrow

Election of Supervisors — District Elections

G

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The current city-wide system of electing San Francisco's Supervisors has created a Board which is out of balance and which does not represent the broad spectrum of views held by San Francisco's voters.

Only one member of the Board comes from the business community, and only two members of the eleven member Board are moderates, even though 43% of San Franciscans voted for Frank Jordan and 48% supported Bill Fazio last November.

This imbalance has led to bad public policy, such as Proposition E, and is the reason why we support a change to the current system of electing Supervisors, and why we support District Elections, Proposition G.

The Republican Party opposed District Elections in the 1970's because the system was flawed. Those flaws have been corrected by the City's Elections Task Force in 1995.

The Task Force developed detailed criteria for creating districts, and hired Professor Rich De Leon and his staff at San Francisco State University to draw the lines. De Leon's proposals were modified by the Task Force based on input at seven public hearings. The districts created are geographically compact and are fair to all of our minorities, communities and our neighborhoods.

Under the old District Elections Plan, one could get elected to the Board with 24% of the vote. The new plan requires run-off elections if no one gets a majority.

Under the old plan, there were no spending limits. Our new Charter allows the board to reduce the spending caps if the voters approve District Elections.

For all of these reasons: to restore balance to the Board, create accountability to the voters, and reduce the cost of getting elected, we support District Elections.

Vote Yes on Proposition G.

San Francisco Republican Party

Arthur Bruzzone

Harold Hoogasian

Christopher Bowman

Jim Gilleran

Woodward Kingman

Manuel Rosales

Elsa Cheung

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was San Francisco Republican Party.

Just imagine: dropping in to a Supervisor's office only a few blocks from home, discussing with him or her a problem on your block, and getting something done about it. When San Francisco had district elections, you could do just that, until big money interests repealed district elections by holding an August special election.

Twenty years later, there are many problems left to solve in our neighborhoods, and still a need for Supervisors who are more accessible and accountable. District elections also reduces the huge costs of campaigning, allowing grassroots activists to run and win. Vote Yes on Proposition G.

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Proposition G means representative government and that every vote counts.

Vote YES on Proposition G!

Harold M. Hoogasian

Candidate for Supervisor

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Hoogasian for Supervisor.

District elections is what a *true democracy* is all about. It brings power *closer* to the People.

Adam Sparks

Candidate for San Francisco School Board

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Friends of Adam Sparks for School Board.

Neighborhood-based district elections for Supervisors is the best way for us to take back our local government from downtown-bankrolled politicians.

Joel Ventresca

Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
City and County of San Francisco Environmental
Commissioner

G

Election of Supervisors — District Elections

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Imagine electing someone to the Board of Supervisors who shares your hopes, and aspirations, someone who has "walked in your shoes."

Imagine a Board of Supervisors that is reflective of the diversity of San Francisco, that is *neighborhood-based, community-oriented and free of the corruption of Big Money.*

Imagine a Board of Supervisors that is *accountable* to you because they got there by knowing and addressing the issues that affect you most. Proposition G, District Elections, can make what can only currently be imagined into a reality.

Return the Board of Supervisors to the citizens of San Francisco. Vote for Electoral Reform, Accountability and Community-based governance. Vote Yes on G.

Chinese American Democratic Club

San Francisco is the only California county that elects its supervisors at-large. District election of supervisors will ensure that no neighborhoods of our city are ignored and underserved. When supervisors live throughout the city, the Board will become more intimately familiar with the everyday problems of ALL citizens. District elections diminishes the influence of big money and high-powered political consultants. Vote yes G.

LESBIANS AND GAYS OF AFRICAN DESCENT FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION (LGADDA)

San Francisco's current electoral system favors candidates with wealthy and powerful "friends." Historically, this system has shut out neighborhoods and underrepresented groups. District Elections requires significantly fewer votes—thus less money—to win. Vote for a more accountable and representative Board!
Vote for electoral reform! Yes on G!

Electoral Reform Coalition

Election of Supervisors — District Elections



PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION G

District elections will be more expensive, not less. First, there will be runoff elections, doubling costs to the City. Second, the Elections Task Force's own report states that the average cost per vote spent by major candidates was \$4.87 in 1977 under district elections and only \$3.15 in 1994. The report says that "per voter expenditures under district elections in 1979 for major candidates was 2.9 times as much as under the at-large system in 1994." **Vote no on G!**

Kevin Piediscalzi

In 1979, under this system, the cost of winning a seat on the board **increased by 16%!** Prop G will NOT curb the high cost of running for office. It will do the opposite. **Vote NO on Proposition G.**

Claire Jolley