[Rebuttal Argument]

6.

Supervisors Gonzalez, Leno BOARD OF SUPERVISORS Rebuttal Argument Motions

Motion authorizing rebuttal to opponent's ballot argument against Proposition J, a Charter Amendment regarding Supervisors Salaries set by the Civil Service Commission.

MOVED, That pursuant to Section 550 of the Municipal Elections Code, the Board of Supervisors does hereby authorize a rebuttal to opponent's ballot argument against Proposition J, a Charter amendment (Third Draft) to amend Section 2.100 to provide that the job of a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco is a full time position, and to provide that the Civil Service Commission shall set the Supervisors' salary once every five (5) years. The Civil Service Commission must consider salaries of other California City Councils and County Boards of Supervisors, and may also consider the Consumer Price Index (CPI). , (File 020884); and, be it

FURTHER MOVED, That the full text of said argument hereby authorized be shown in the copy attached to this motion and is hereby declared to be a part hereof; and, be it

FURTHER MOVED, That the Director of Elections be and is hereby authorized and directed to include said argument in the pamphlet accompanying the sample ballots to be mailed to the voters of the City and County of San Francisco for the election to be held on Tuesday, November 5, 2002.

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS PREFERRED FORMAT FOR SUBMITTING LOCAL BALLOT ARGUMENT Declaration by Aut of Arguments and / or Rebuttals

THE UNDERSIGNED AUTHOR(S) OF THIS BALLOT ARGUMENT _X_FOR or __AGAINST PROPOSITION J FOR THE ELECTION TO BE HELD IN SAN FRANCISCO ON NOVEMBER 5, 2002 HEREBY STATE THAT SUCH ARGUMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF HIS/HER/THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. ALL SIGNERS OF THIS ARGUMENT MUST BE REGISTERED TO VOTE IN SAN FRANCISCO

Style Notes B,I, or BI		# of words in each line
	The era when San Francisco Supervisors can be "citizen legislators" has passed.	11
!	Historically, the Board was made up of wealthy aristocrats who visited city hall	13
	once a week to check-in. Now, with a \$5 billion dollar budget to oversee, this	16
	arrangement is impossible and only favors those in City government who do not	13
	want full-time Supervisors overseeing their work or lack thereof.	10
	Many citizens complain that there isn't enough oversight of the Mayor and City	13
	Departments. That is because we hamstring the Supervisors by not paying them	12
	a decent wage and by hardly giving them any staff.	10
В	While it is true San Francisco has more supervisors than other counties, San	11
В	Francisco is unique in being the only City and County in California. We	13
	have no City Council - only a Board of Supervisors. San Jose has ten Council	13
	members and Santa Clara County has five Supervisors, for a total of fifteen	12
	legislators. San Francisco has eleven.	4
	The opposition claims that setting wages should not be delegated to the Civil	13
В	Service Commission but that is who currently sets the salary of every other	13
В	elected official in San Francisco. Why should the Board be treated differently?	11
	This measure also provides that if city workers take a pay reduction due to hard	15
	economic times that the Supervisors would have to take the same reduction.	12
	Workers will not assume a burden that "management" doesn't also accept.	11





City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Motion

File Number:

021393

Date Passed:

August 26, 2002

Motion authorizing rebuttal to opponent's ballot argument against Proposition J, a Charter Amendment regarding Supervisors salaries set by the Civil Service Commission.

August 26, 2002 Board of Supervisors — AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE

BEARING SAME TITLE

Ayes: 11 - Ammiano, Daly, Gonzalez, Hall, Leno, Maxwell, McGoldrick,

Newsom, Peskin, Sandoval, Yee

August 26, 2002 Board of Supervisors — APPROVED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 9 - Ammiano, Daly, Gonzalez, Hall, Leno, Maxwell, McGoldrick, Peskin,

Sandoval

Noes: 2 - Newsom, Yee

File No. 021393

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was APPROVED AS AMENDED on August 26, 2002 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Gloria L. Young

Clerk of the Board