PROPOSITION I

Shall the City regulate the fees that taxicab permit holders may charge to taxicab operators, and the fees that operators may charge to drivers, and shall the City be required to establish a centralized dispatch system for all taxicabs?

YES  NO

---

Digest
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City issues a limited number of taxicab permits. To receive a permit, a person does not need to have experience driving a taxicab. The permit holder may choose to operate the taxicab, or may charge a fee to another person or company for the right to operate the taxicab. This fee is called a “permit use fee.” In turn, the operator may charge drivers for the right to drive a taxicab during a particular shift. This fee is called a “gate fee.” The City regulates fares, but does not regulate permit use fees or gate fees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would require the City to set maximum permit use fees and gate fees. An increase or decrease in the gate fee could result in an increase or decrease in cab fares. This would also restrict operators from requiring certain additional payments from drivers.

Proposition I would require the establishment of a centralized dispatch system for all taxicabs. Passengers could still request the services of a particular taxi company.

The City would be required to consider a variety of methods of improving taxicab service before issuing additional taxicab permits. These methods would include wheelchair accessible cabs and peak-time only cabs.

This proposition would require that persons receiving a taxicab permit have a specified level of experience driving taxicabs in San Francisco.

Under Proposition I the number of formal safety inspections of taxicabs would go from one a year to two a year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the laws regulating taxicabs.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the laws regulating taxicabs.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it could have a significant effect on the cost of government depending on how it is implemented. The major cost item is a Citywide central dispatch service which could cost several million dollars to purchase and operate. The ordinance does not specify what agency will operate this dispatch service. If the City operates the service, it could result in increases in taxi fees to cover the costs. If the dispatch service is operated by taxicab companies and if it simply replaces individual dispatch units, there may be no cost to government or effect on taxi rates.

The City would be required to conduct semi-annual rather than an annual inspection of taxicabs as provided under current rules; the cost of the inspections would continue to be paid for by the taxi companies.

Also, the City would be required to perform investigative and regulatory processes and hold additional public hearings at costs that should not exceed $50,000 to $100,000 per year.

How “I” Got on the Ballot
On July 31, 1995 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Ammiano, Bierman, Hallinan, Kennedy, Migden, and Shelley.
NO: Supervisors Alioto, Hsieh, Kaufman, Leal, and Teng.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT BEGINS ON PAGE 106.
PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Vote Yes on Proposition I

Your YES vote on Proposition I will mean better cab service. This proposition will provide the machinery to establish centralized dispatching. Centralized dispatching means that all taxi dispatch services will be interconnected. With one phone call to any company, callers would potentially have at their disposal all 967 cabs in the city. The caller would also have the option of selecting only one company to respond. Centralized dispatching will mean better service citywide, but especially in outlying neighborhoods and during rush hours.

Proposition I will also allow for peak-time permits to enable the city to put out extra cabs at the busiest times, such as New Year’s Eve, or when a large convention is absorbing all the city’s cabs.

Proposition I will answer the need for wheelchair-accessible cabs by insuring that enough permits are issued to meet the demand for these vehicles. New regulations will assure wheelchair users high-quality service.

Proposition I will increase taxi safety by doubling the number of inspections of cabs over one year old.

Proposition I will eliminate a major inequity in SF’s taxi industry which current regulation allows. Cab drivers are being overcharged by cab companies, and are having difficulty making a decent wage at a dangerous occupation. Experienced drivers are leaving the industry, because they simply cannot make a fair living working 10-12 hours each shift. Drivers must take in more than $100 per shift before starting to make money for themselves. This legislation requires the Board of Supervisors to regulate the cab rental fee paid by the driver. This will not only bring justice to the cab driver, but will insure that the city will hold onto its professional, long-term drivers.

We urge you to vote YES on these reforms.

Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

MAYORAL CANDIDATES’ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We, the candidates running for Mayor of San Francisco, believe that Proposition I takes San Francisco in the wrong direction and prevents the City from addressing the real challenges it faces. Health care, transportation, homelessness, crime and education are just a few of the real social and economic challenges for the City to address.

Proposition I would create a new bureaucracy that will require new hearings, additional staff and more regulation.

According to the San Francisco Controller and an economic study of the measure, Proposition I could cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars. If Proposition I passes vital city services could be put in jeopardy in order to pay the costs of implementing this measure. San Francisco’s budget is already stretched as far as it can go. We can’t afford Proposition I.

Proposition I doesn’t address the real problems for taxi drivers. The drivers behind the wheel need real solutions to the issues they face as working men and women. Proposition I does not address their issues.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Joel Ventresca, Candidate for Mayor
Mayor Frank Jordan
Supervisor Angela Alioto
Speaker Emeritus Willie Brown
Ben Hom
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The City should not be required to establish a centralized dispatch system for all taxicabs.
Vote NO on I.

Joel Ventresca
Public Interest Mayoral Candidate
Ventresca for Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote Yes on Proposition I
Centralized dispatch will require that taxicab companies deal in a systematic fashion with orders they accept but cannot fill. Callers will always have the option of requesting exclusive services from the company of their choice. If the caller is willing to accept other companies’ cabs, those companies will have a chance to fill the order after a certain period of time has elapsed.

Linking the city’s various dispatch services will bring many benefits:
• Callers requesting special services such as smoking cabs, or drivers with language skills, will have available all 867 of the city’s cabs, rather than only those of a particular company.
• Wheelchair users in particular will benefit in having access to all the wheelchair-accessible cabs in the city, rather than the small handful that will be associated with each individual company.
• Drivers will benefit, not least from the system’s ability to detect duplicate orders.

Centralized dispatch can be established at a minimal cost. All it would require is computers in each of the dispatch offices, and the software to link them. Taxicab companies will bear the costs of this improvement, just as they pay for their radios, meters, and other things the law requires. The public needs this significant service improvement, and drivers need the income that greater efficiency in dispatching will bring them. The technology is simple, and it’s there — let’s use it!

Board of Supervisors
Taxicabs

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The cab-company-financed "No on I" campaign is being dishonest with the voters. Here are just a few of its false claims:

**LIE:** Prop I will create a "new Department of Taxis" at great cost.
**TRUTH:** There is no new department. The city's Budget Analyst has concluded that Prop I will require one more police officer and 1.5 clerks to administer, at a cost of $125,000 a year, paid for by the taxi industry.

**LIE:** Centralized dispatch "will cost the city millions".
**TRUTH:** Centralized dispatch won't cost the city a penny. It can be set up very cheaply, and the industry will assume the costs. Cab company claims are fanciful projections based on false premises.

**LIE:** "Gate control failed in Boston."
**TRUTH:** Gate control has worked well in Boston for over five years. It has worked in Minneapolis for 10 years and Chicago has recently adopted it.
The list of lies and distortions goes on. Don't believe them. Vote YES on Proposition I.

Drivers for Better Cab Service
*Joe Mirabile*, Treasurer

(For Identification Purposes Only)

We support Proposition I because it will bring long-overdue reforms to an industry more concerned with profits than with service to the public or the well-being of its workers.
Vote **YES** on Proposition I.

**Patrick Fitzgerald**
**Tony Kilroy**
**Bob Geary**
*Members*
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Proposition I promotes convenience for the many residents who depend on efficient, reliable taxi service. A centralized dispatch system will make it easier to get a cab when you need one. Vote Yes on I.

*Supervisor Kevin Shelley*
*Supervisor Carole Migden*

"If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Unfortunately, the response of some to this ballot measure seems to be:
If it IS broke, don't fix it.

Taxi company owners/managers, drivers, passengers and city officials **AGREE** that there are problems within San Francisco's taxi industry.

Drivers and passengers have a solution to the taxi problems we've all experienced:
Unacceptably long delays in neighborhood service calls.
Failure of wheelchair-accessible ramped taxis to promptly and consistently serve the disabled.
Great difficulty in getting a taxi in rush hours and on Fridays.
All recent previous taxi measures have been industry-sponsored — and been rejected.
Let's stop posturing and power-brokering. This measure presents solutions to some of the problems we've long endured.
Let's support labor and passengers.
Vote **YES** on Proposition I.

**Bob Planthold**
*Member, Paratransit Council Executive Committee*

At its heart, Proposition I is about justice. The valuable privileges which the city bestows upon the taxi industry are being abused. Cab drivers pay excessive fees for leasing taxis and daily payoffs to dispatchers are the norm. While drivers struggle to earn a meager livelihood, cab companies and taxicab permit holders are reaping huge profits from dubious practices such as these.

Proposition I will not cure all the industry's ills, but it will improve service and help restore to the cab driver the dignity and fundamental fairness all workers deserve.

*Supervisor Sue Bierman*
*Supervisor Tom Ammiano*
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a driver-sponsored initiative — not, like previous taxi measures, a company-sponsored fraud.

Proposition I will eliminate blatant abuses. Taxi rental fees in 1980 were $29 a shift. Now they average over $80 (up to $92). Enormous profits are going to taxi companies and the holders of taxicab permits, which the City issues for free.

Yellow Cab’s profits in recent years have been over 50% of revenues. More than half the money drivers pay in taxi rental fees are going to Yellow’s permit holders. In fiscal year 1994, Yellow’s cost for putting a cab on the street was $36. Yet the company raised its lease fees from $73 to $80 a shift, an increase over the previous year of almost 10%. Inflation was 2.4%.

The City controls meter rates and the number of cabs. Capping outrageous profits will complete the regulatory scheme. With an end to profiteering good, experienced drivers will remain in the industry.

Our industry is awash in graft. Proposition I will help correct that, too.

Passengers and drivers suffer from inefficient dispatch service. At public hearings, companies, dispatchers, drivers and communications experts will devise the most efficient and cost-effective way to interconnect dispatch services.

Stop the abuse.

Improve taxi service.

Vote to do both with a YES ON I.

United Taxicab Workers/CWA 9410
James K. Lewis, Chair

(for identification purposes only)

Out of town on November 7, 1995? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 32¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OPPOSE PROPOSITION I

Labor deserves fair representation in the cab companies. Unfortunately, Proposition I does not provide that. Proposition I actually revokes workers collective bargaining rights. It provides no health or welfare benefits, pensions, vacation time or job security. Proposition I is unfair to the working men and women of San Francisco.

In fact, by tying up cab companies in an endless bureaucratic maze of red tape, Proposition I would in effect encourage the dissolution of cab companies and the loss of well paying, union jobs such as mechanics and gasoline pump operators.

Support organized labor. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Robert Gordon
Juan Gallegos
Angel Estrada
John King
Jose Amador
Jose Villalobos
Wai Kong
Nelson Tam
R. Rodriguez
David Chow
Automotive Mechanics, Local 1414

Al Tomas
Thomas Collins
Georgie Amaya
Kenneth Noda
Mario Duarte
Ricardo Albert Hernandez
Brian Johansen, Teamsters Local 665
Larry Mazola, Business Manager, Plumbers

Women of San Francisco Oppose Proposition I

If Proposition I passes it could force women who are sick or who have complicated pregnancies, and need time off, to give back their permits to drive a cab. This isn’t faire, and it isn’t right.

Implementing the centralized dispatch system and the new city department proposed in Proposition I will cost the city millions of dollars. It will either force the Supervisors to cut badly needed programs or raise taxes. Either way we lose.

No on Proposition I, it doesn’t make sense for San Francisco.

Assessor Doris M. Ward
Cara Sheean
Nicole Hampton
Maria Monet, Trustee S.F. City College

SMALL BUSINESS

As small business owners in San Francisco, we look forward to the challenges of entrepreneurship; running our business, meeting a payroll, serving our customers and contributing to our neighborhoods. We also know firsthand how difficult it is to comply with government red tape and bureaucracy.

That is why we oppose Proposition I.

Proposition I would give the Board of Supervisors the power to regulate an already well-functioning business — taxicabs. Proposition I would allow the Board to set fares and dispatch cabs. It could require a whole new city department with additional city employees.

San Francisco cab companies already serve our city very well. Allowing City Hall to run San Francisco’s taxis makes no business sense at all!

Please join us in voting NO on Proposition I.

Jack Immendorf
M.A. Rosales
Clifford Waldeck

Angelo Quaranta
Dar Singh
Dennis Wong
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

DON'T HIT THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY — VOTE NO ON PROP I

The hospitality industry is the largest employer in the City, consisting of restaurants, hotels, night clubs and taxicabs. Prop I would take control out of the hands of the cab companies and give it to City Hall. It would give the bulk of the decisions affecting the industry to the Board of Supervisors. This will hurt our City’s taxi service and the entire hospitality industry that it serves.

Proposition I will lessen a cab company’s ability to maintain clean and safe cabs. Good service and clean cabs contribute to the appeal and ease of visiting San Francisco’s restaurants and attractions. Let the experienced operators, not the politicians, run the taxicabs.

A recent survey showed that 73% of the City’s cab riders were satisfied with the service and 74% like the cab’s appearance. IF IT'S NOT BROKEN, DON'T FIX IT!

Robert Begley
Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Paul Lazareschi
President, Golden Gate Restaurant Association

SENIORS OPPOSE PROPOSITION I

Many years ago, we purchased taxicab medallions and stock in our co-operative companies in the good faith that we could pass our investment on to our children. Proposition I could take away our medallions because we are retired. We will have no income after years of hard work. Changing the rules after we have retired isn’t fair.

If Proposition I passes we will be unable to support ourselves. Seniors are already being attacked in Washington over Social Security. We don’t deserve this here in San Francisco.

Protect San Francisco Seniors. Please vote NO on Proposition I!

Arthur Belyez  Richard Andrews  Arthur Lembke  DeWayne Keen  Harold Silverstein  Monroe Silverstein  Fred Seronick  Herman Wikkeling  Loraine Wikkeling  Morris Commer  Mildred Rancatore  Frank Tripoli  Harry Yee  Mario Minoletti

Pat Mason, PhD, Economist

As an economist for 20 years, I was asked to conduct a study on the financial implications of Proposition I. After confering with experts in government bureaucracy as well as financial experts on city budget matters, I prepared an economic study of Proposition I. My conclusion is that the measure will cost the City millions of dollars.

In my opinion, Prop I mandates an entire new government bureaucracy to oversee and regulate the industry. It also requires that City Hall get in the business of dispatching cabs — and builds a massive new multi-million dollar system similar to 911.

Under Prop I, the City will have to hire a minimum of 72 new employees at an estimated cost of $38 million in salaries and benefits in the first year alone. Building and housing the central dispatch system, plus installing computers in every cab, will cost at least $3.6 million. $4.4 million will be required just to maintain the system each year. After conducting my study, I have concluded that the total estimated cost of Prop I's mandates the first year alone, is $7.9 to $8.1 million dollars.

Dr. Patrick F. Mason

NO ON I — DON'T PERMIT MORE PUBLIC MISMANAGEMENT

In 1978 I personally wrote the taxicab initiative to end monopolistic profiteering and trading in taxicab permits. You, the voter, passed it. Proposition I, however, doesn't match the voters' intentions in doing so. The Board of Supervisors needs to be constantly reminded that ours is a democratic, not a socialistic, society. Proposition I constitutes a power grab, engineered by a cadre seeking financial gain in cabsoots with Board of Supervisors bent on creating a new bureaucracy, headed by its own Taxi Czar — just what financially-strapped San Francisco needs!

The incredible notion of certain supervisors, presently unable even to effectuate efficient 911 or Muni service, creating a centralized taxi dispatch network plus setting the industry's internal fee schedules and transferring public safety oversight from the Police Department to themselves, imperils both public safety and our General Fund. Most importantly, Proposition I contains no guarantee of improved taxi service.

The aim of the Board of Supervisors should be to end San Francisco's financial free-fall by reducing, not increasing, government. Don't give the supervisors one more public utility to mismanage. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I Makes a BAD Situation WORSE — Vote NO

If you have ever tried to get a cab in some of our neighborhoods you would understand why we don’t have a lot of faith in Proposition I. Bayview, Hunters Point, Visitiation Valley, OMI, parts of the Western Addition and the Mission cannot count on the same level of service as the city’s wealthier neighborhoods. Our experience with “city run” dispatch systems like 911 has not solved our problems either. Proposition I seems like yet another proposal to “reform” the taxi industry that doesn’t address issues of fairness and discrimination of certain communities in this city. Furthermore, Proposition I could cost the city millions in general fund dollars and potentially raise taxi fares — neither option is acceptable to our communities.

Until political leaders start dealing with the real issues affecting low income residents in the neighborhoods, we will continue to Vote NO on insincere reforms that don’t address our needs. No on Proposition I.

Assessor Doris M. Ward
Community College Trustee Jim Mayo
Rev. Arnold Townsend
Gwendolyne Westbrook, President, Black Leadership Forum
Sabrina Saunders
D. Minor
Pastor Michael Williams
Millard Larkin
Doctor Caesar A. Churchwell
Rev. Cordell Hawkins
Karen L. Huggins
Espinola Jackson
David Serrano Sewell
Hadie Reid
San Francisco Housing Authority Commission

Transportation Leaders Agree — Vote No on I

As individuals active in a variety of transportation boards, commissions and issues we strongly urge you to vote against Proposition I. The proposition does nothing to improve the quality of taxicab transit within San Francisco. It merely loads up city government with more hidden costs and bureaucratic layers. While most local governments around the country are trying to consolidate resources and work cooperatively with the private sector, Proposition I would create a bureaucratic mess. Government oversight of the cab industry and a costly centralized dispatch system would be a considerable expense to the city’s general fund and would increase taxicab fares.

Citywide transportation should be safe, affordable and inexpensive. Proposition I will take the city in the wrong direction. Join us in voting NO.

Arlene Chen Wong
Public Transportation Commissioner
Jon Ballesteros
Public Transportation Commissioner

BALLOT ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I — Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

After careful examination of Proposition I, I found numerous flaws. That is why I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Proposition I does nothing to improve taxicab service for the citizens of San Francisco. The measure could penalize those who miss work due to a pregnancy or a serious illness by revoking their permits to drive, resulting in a loss of jobs for San Franciscans. The centralized dispatch system will not deliver more taxicabs to the neighborhoods. Finally, Proposition I will cost the residents of San Francisco millions of dollars.

Do not believe phony calls for reform. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

LAW ENFORCEMENT SAYS VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

The City of Boston enacted a measure similar to Prop I in 1989. Now they have six police officers assigned full-time to watching the taxi industry, and their Captains say they need even more: corruption has exploded among dispatchers and drivers since the measure passed. Gate control will mean corruption in our industry.

Prop I threatens public safety. Enforcement of its many regulations will fall to the police department — an additional burden they don’t need. Police should patrol the neighborhoods, not the taxi garages.

Law enforcement officials agree. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Sheriff Michael Hennessy
District Attorney Arlo Smith
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN ARGUMENTS

Here they go again!

Proposition I is yet another power grab by politicians and special interests to regulate, bureaucratize and bring a critical city service under the control of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Yet, some would like to give the Board of Supervisors power to regulate the taxi industry — including the power to set fares and dispatch cabs!

If approved, Proposition I will add another layer to an already bloated City government by creating a new "Taxi Department". Proposition I would require hiring additional city employees and give City Hall control over an already well-run and successful private business.

Keep the Board of Supervisors out of the taxi business. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Manuel Rosales
Arthur Bruzzone
Vera Karamardian
Christopher Bowman
Cara Figone

We, as working San Francisco taxicab drivers, urge a NO vote on Proposition I.

It would install an inefficient, costly centralized dispatch system, promote the fraud of so-called peak time permits and bring us under bureaucratic control by the Board of Supervisors.

Bill Nieboer
Michael Purcell
David Murphy
Rocky Simpson
Donald Alger
William Barnett
Carl Christensen
John Law
Anthony Perez
James McCann
Sean Morgan
Lawrence Orenstein
Lonna Denny
John Warren
Larry Alhadef
Ralph Deming
Martin Moore
Bob Johnston

Allen Thompson
Joel Anderson
David Do
Gersham
Charles Gale
Raymond Mar
Jimmy Chang
Wei Lee
John Ma
Gary Hon
Jeff Harrison
T. Robyn Mcro
Jerome Lynch
Edwin Jew
Wills Brozzi
Rick Beal
Larry Rosenblatt

Ricardo Lopez
John Panages
Ronald Schefranek
Duncan Dong
Ron Zannastaw
James Newsom
Kavoos Kavoosi
Tony Chu
Albert Segabo
Francis Gonzalez
John Dieszo
Frank de Mesa
Stan Marble
Bill Norton
Jack Moreno
Kwing Gee
Boris Rainer

We, as working San Francisco taxicab drivers, urge a NO vote on Proposition I.

It would install an inefficient, costly centralized dispatch system, promote the fraud of so-called peak time permits and bring us under bureaucratic control by the Board of Supervisors.

Desoto
Edward J. Scoble
Ricardo Munansala
Yellow Cab
Jose Medrano
Reynaldo Magno
Edwin Sayabyab
Benjamin Lissog
Rolando Marchales
Jimmy Abilar
Jack Majewski
Antonio Guerrarra
Tante Patacsil

NEIGHBORHOOD LEADERS OPPOSE PROPOSITION I

Proposition I won't bring needed cabs to our neighborhoods. In fact, Proposition I will institute an unworkable system that will make cabs less responsive. Proposition I will send more cabs to Fisherman's Wharf and Downtown while the neighborhoods are left stranded.

We can't afford Proposition I. Our neighborhood services will suffer at the expense of this costly new system. We should not pour valuable City money into an unworkable system simply because the special interests at City Hall want to control the taxicabs.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

Mitchell Omerberg, Director, Affordable Housing Alliance
Sam Murray, President, New Bayview Committee
Taxicabs

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We, as working San Francisco taxicab drivers, urge a NO vote on Proposition I.

It would install an inefficient, costly centralized dispatch system, promote the fraud of so-called peak time permits and bring us under bureaucratic control by the Board of Supervisors.

Brian Coop
Brent Haueisen
Raymond Rodriguez
John Christopher
Alfred Riggs
Richard Lubinski
Terry Hensley
Kevin Doyle
Naum Vaksman
Kye Rorie, II
Craig Wilson
Michael Schwartz
Luis Curiel
Carlos Ramirez
Joseph Frank
Michael Gibbons

Victor Bubbett
Jeff Ecker
Gary Sartor
Michael McLaughlin
Richard White
Harb
Robert Friedman
Kim Olson
Larry V. Mitchell
Jeffrey Wheeler
Tara Shannon
Paul Fernandez
Richard Cannon
Alan Gochef
Rudy Robling

James McGlew
Peter LeBares
Herbert Grant
Richard Graham
James Bottomff
Willie Mays
Johnson
Roy Glass
Suzanne Rathert
Philip Anton
Kenneth Whipple
Thomas Ferris
Adam Cohen
David Mathews
Lewis Jackson
Michael Burns

DeSoto Cab
C.H. Brown
Jason Nagota
Damon Lindberg
Frank Sullivan
Ed Lehmann
Julia Edwinson
High Fontaine
Tomm Perea
Gordon F. Bell
Fiorenin Angelelescu
Robert Hartunian
William Field
John Flarkey
Wing N. Tse
Chad Pence
Wayne Rantanen
James Chan
Albert Yamboa
Wenata
Wymiarkiewicz
Glen Gray
Dan Hinds
Mike Eaton
Bill Hunger
David Brown
National Cab
M. Fisherman
Bhadan Johal
Rafael Machkovsky
Boris Smilovitsky
Alex Shimmar
Torgunakov
Blue Bird Cab
Tray Vo
Sang Phuenguyen
Mikhael Korolev
Vitaly Pikarevich

Metro
Rich Vo
Richard Hygels
James Bonser
Luxor
Jim Sward
Richard Koury
Chris Colon
Richard Ellis
Bachar
Ian McKeown
Joel Wolk
Thomas Moore
Dan Pena
Warren Brunt
Johnny Ron
Philip Lellman
LaLu Nuong
Kevin McNamee
M.D. Fredrick
Jim Mare
Noel Pacter
Ron Ballett
Ralph Craig
David Wagner
Edward Kass
Mark Powell
Deonley
Vasilios Margianni
Ghanem Elmasni
San Martinovsky
Dmitry Vaynshytyn
Jeffrey Rapoport
Dale Fuller
Robert Conrad
Migab Rahman
Joseph Barsse

White and Blue
Hing Hom
Roland Hom
Smilovitsky
Veterans
Matt Sutter
Shelley Burton
Peter Fox
William Cline
John Avery
Austin Peterson
Paul Taylor
Michael Turner
Stephen Phillips
Jeff Caffin
Mazen Hakooz
Walter Farrell
Bob Valdez
Jonahon Chalich
Paul Christians
Gary Sharp
Richard Loewen
Tito Dzieniowski
Ron Wolter
Ron Larry
Keith Harris
Joseph Warne
William Steinway
Bruce Randolph
Miller
Edward Christen
Bruno Anton
Fred Anthony
Peter Varga
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We, as working San Francisco taxicab drivers, urge a NO vote on Proposition I.
It would install an inefficient, costly centralized dispatch system, promote the fraud of so-called peak time permits and bring us under bureaucratic control by the Board of Supervisors.

Yellow Cab Drivers
Amelio Frias
Antone Marjai
Robert Cesama
James Cortesos
Johnny Friedman
Sam Kaplowitz
Waldu Kalati
John Elford
Richard Andrews
Doug DiBoll
Katherine Taylor
George rasmussen
Mohd Erhil
Joseph Barse
Richard Healy
Winfield McCoy
Daniel Coughlin
Robert Venegas
Louis Mass
Jaime Moreno
Claudio Alarcao
Robert Walker
Yard Felke
Harold Duhon
Terrence Edenborg
Tony Lama

Ken Tong
Bill Delaney
Tom Jobe
Roberto Menas
Charles Morton
Dan Guhyan
John Ranes
Jim Estringer
Peter Parisi
Conrado Datlag
Hossien Fazeli
Stephen Reimers
Adolf Bernatsky
Hersh Karp
DeSoto Cab

Peter Linehan
Joseph Palella
Phil Sterlin
Paul Mitchell
William Lum
Joseph Lorenzo
Thomas Tounas
Michael Travis
Michael Williams
Tom Casey
Ricci Sims
Charles Speidel
Mustafa
P. Baumgarten
Anwari
Charles Roling
Randy Bottom
Donald J. Templeton
Sai M. Lee
John Cruse
Ismael Basco
Wing Seek Tse
Michael Hall Tamblyn
Henry Stern
Clifford Lundberg
Steven Leonovicz
Victoria Landown
Kathleen Hughes
Susan Ramsey
Steven Rock
George Huie
Ronald Moise
Richard Cottrell
James Gettys
Edwin Santiago

Herbert Gee
Miguel Fernandez
James Panther
Albert Behravesh
Dwight Browning
Richard Bryers
James Bolig
Leonard Ribiero
Lorenzo Saquic
Paul Keh
George McGrath
Michael Wilson
Brian Coop
Laura St. James
Les Hollis
Adnan Atshan
Andrew Sobozisky
Buzz Tietjen
Louie Lipmin
Ahmad
Jim Candles
Syed Molsin
William J. Harjo
Joe Lipkins
Molsen Hassan
Kurt P. Brecht
Ostana M. Awwad
A. Sinaiko
Morris Fong
Solomon
Michael Davenport
John Boyle
Humberto Espinosa
Mazen Alkilani
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We, as working San Francisco taxi drivers, urge a NO vote on Proposition I.

It would install an inefficient, costly centralized dispatch system, promote the fraud of so-called peak time permits and bring us under bureaucratic control by the Board of Supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunshine</th>
<th>T.O. Loewenstein</th>
<th>Vladimir Leyrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louie Herrada</td>
<td>Joe Brozello</td>
<td>Ed Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Sanz</td>
<td>Tony Desimonia</td>
<td>Checker Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>J. Howard Kelley</td>
<td>Lipich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran</td>
<td>Ross Carpenter</td>
<td>Traub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon</td>
<td>Paul V. Ridley</td>
<td>Bay Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Wong</td>
<td>Gwendolyn Flash</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Cab</td>
<td>York Tober</td>
<td>Borukovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julio Postiglione</td>
<td>Keith Fazackerley</td>
<td>Universal Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muuwitya Ashrieh</td>
<td>W.S. Johnson</td>
<td>Viktor Morgulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo Shairaly</td>
<td>David Ackers</td>
<td>SF Cab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine Wiley</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Trin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Teixieka</td>
<td>Stanchelli</td>
<td>Other Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. William Vega</td>
<td>Khamatovsky</td>
<td>Charles Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Levin</td>
<td>Stasman Dina</td>
<td>Jose Labrador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fields</td>
<td>United Cab</td>
<td>Barry K. Taranto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gilmour</td>
<td>Grigory</td>
<td>Bill Minikie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Beaumars</td>
<td>Labarsky</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nollie Griffin</td>
<td>Jaswinder Mann</td>
<td>Chinielewski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Fisher</td>
<td>Peter Ho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kanos</td>
<td>Vancam Vo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Francisco Democratic Party Opposes Proposition I

Proposition I does not reform the taxi industry. It simply adds layers of bureaucracy at a cost of millions to city residents. Important city programs will be compromised as city resources are overburdened. Democrats are sympathetic to the concerns of taxi drivers. We support better pay, benefits and working conditions for drivers, dispatchers and support staff. But Proposition I is not the solution.

A city run centralized dispatch system might look good on paper but who will run it and at what cost to the city? According to the Controllers Statement it could cost several million dollars to purchase and operate. If the city runs the dispatch system scarce general fund dollars will be taken away from vital social programs. If the taxi companies are forced to run the system taxi fares could go up to pay for it. Either way we lose.

Please join the San Francisco Democratic Party in Voting NO on Proposition I.

State Senator Milton Marks
Natalie Berg
Chair, SF Democratic Central Committee
Jim West
Claudine Cheng
Rick Hauptman
Lula M. Carter
Lee Ann Prifti

SUPPORT IMPROVED ACCESS, VOTE NO ON PROP I

Paratransit scrip provides elderly and disabled citizens of San Francisco prompt taxi service at an affordable cost. To qualify for the Paratransit Scrip program, a taxi cab company must carry extra liability insurance and provide an 8% discount to scrip users. Proposition I, by loading companies down with red tape and bureaucracy, would make participation in current programs difficult, if not impossible.

Should Proposition I make it more profitable for permit holders to “go it alone,” rather than remain in companies, our entire program could be scuttled.

Hold the line on Paratransit. Vote NO on Proposition I.

Jill Sweringen, Physical Therapist
Viola Jackson
Dee Ann Hendrix

Health Providers Say NO to Proposition I

Taxicabs are a vital component of patient and health services. Many patients rely on taxis to take them to the doctor’s office or hospital. Proposition I would NOT get cabs to patients’ doors more quickly or reliably. In fact, it would diminish accountability and the incentive for prompt service.

Present company dispatched radio service may not be perfect, but it is accountable. All patients have access to prompt, ACCOUNTABLE service. Under Proposition “I” a company that did not send a taxi would be able to hand off its failure to respond to a Centralized Dispatch, where there would be no urgency to respond.

Keep our taxi dispatch system in good health. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Norman Mangilbuyat, Pharmacy Technician,
Davies Medical Center
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Supervisors Agree, Vote No on Proposition I

As Supervisors of San Francisco it is our responsibility to say yes to good public policy and no to bad public policy. Proposition I is bad public policy:

1. Proposition I will cost San Francisco money we don’t have. According to the SF Controller the Centralized Dispatch system component of Proposition I could cost millions of dollars. Our City’s budget is stretched as it is. If Proposition I passes we may be forced to either cut vital programs and services or to raise taxes to cover the costs of implementing this proposition.

2. Proposition I doesn’t fix the tough issues taxi drivers confront every day. Proposition I doesn’t deal with driver’s employment status, health insurance, pensions, job security or driver safety issues.

3. A similar “Gate Control” system was tried in Boston and failed. It led to increased corruption and made service worse. Boston’s cabs are older and less safe than San Francisco’s.

4. Proposition I doesn’t improve service to neighborhoods. Residents of the neighborhoods, particularly the physically challenged, seniors and those suffering from an illness need an expanded paratransit system.

5. Proposition I creates an unneeded new bureaucracy. It will require new hearings, more staff, more regulation and additional work for existing City departments.

Proposition I doesn’t deal effectively with the public policy issues faced by the taxicab industry. We urge a No vote on Proposition I. It doesn’t make sense for San Francisco.

Supervisor Mabel Teng
Supervisor Angela Alioto
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Susan Leal

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