

Regulation of Taxicabs



PROPOSITION P

Shall Proposition K, regulating taxicab permits, be repealed upon the Board of Supervisors' adoption of a taxicab permit ordinance that follows the principles of Proposition K?

YES 277 →
NO 278 →

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City issues permits for taxicabs under rules set out in Proposition K, a law passed by the voters on June 6, 1978. Since the voters passed Proposition K, only the voters may change it. Proposition K states that taxicab permits are the property of the City and may not be sold or otherwise transferred, and that the Police Commission must issue a sufficient number of permits to provide adequate taxicab service throughout the City.

A person seeking a taxicab permit must prove by clear and convincing evidence that public necessity and convenience require the operation of the vehicles for which the person seeks a permit. People granted such permits must drive the vehicle for at least four hours during any 24 hour period for at least 75 percent of the business days during the calendar year.

New permits are issued only one each to individuals and not to businesses. If a business obtained permits before Proposition K was passed, it may keep the permits unless the business sells or transfers more than ten percent of its ownership. Such a sale or transfer

makes the permits invalid.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P would repeal Proposition K and permit the Board of Supervisors to change the rules for issuing taxicab permits without a vote of the people. However, the Board of Supervisors would be required to pass a law following the principles of Proposition K, including not allowing the transfer of permits, promotion of owner-operators and mandatory dispatch and radio control of all taxis. The repeal would go into effect when the Board of Supervisors adopts an ordinance setting rules for issuing taxicab permits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to repeal Proposition K when the Board of Supervisors passes a law setting rules for issuing taxicab permits. That ordinance must follow the principles of Proposition K.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to repeal Proposition K.

Controller's Statement on "P"

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

"Should the proposed initiative ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "P"

On July 18, the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on the question of placing Proposition P on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Richard Hongisto, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy Walker.

NO: Supervisor Bill Maher.

LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION P IS ON PAGE 91

P

Regulation of Taxicabs

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

Taxicabs are a necessary part of our transportation system, a public service for all kinds of people. Residents, business people, tourists, and especially those with special needs — the elderly and the disabled — are often dependent on taxicabs. That is why taxicabs are licensed and regulated.

But, taxicab regulations, just like all other matters of municipal concern, need to change to reflect conditions. Unfortunately, under the present law (an initiative ordinance adopted in 1978), the Board of Supervisors cannot change matters affecting taxicab permits. That doesn't make any sense. This ordinance preserves all the same principals and purposes of the 1978 ordinance but allows the Board of Supervisors to enact new provisions necessary to make cab service more available to the entire community. Among other matters, the new ordinance would allow the Board of

Supervisors to:

- 1) Ensure enforcement of taxicab regulations by imposing a fee on permit holders.
- 2) provide more cabs on temporary permits for those occasions when more taxicabs are truly needed.
- 3) Make all cabs respond to regulated neighborhood taxicab radio dispatch services, which cannot be done under the present law.

It has been 10 years since the taxicab law of San Francisco has been revised — it's time for a change. If you believe that taxicab service could and should be better than it now is, please vote for reform, vote Yes on P.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The Board of Supervisors claims to like the taxicab reform law we voters adopted in 1978. They say their replacement ordinance would follow the same "principles and purposes" of that law. So why change?

VOTE NO ON P!

Still, if changes are needed in our taxicab reform law, why don't the supervisors submit specific items to the voters for approval? After all, that's how the initiative process is supposed to work. The voters enacted our taxicab reform law; the voters should be allowed to approve any changes.

VOTE NO ON P!

Instead, Proposition P asks us to scrap all existing taxicab regulations and forever relinquish our control over taxicab law to the Board of Supervisors. For one thing, you don't tear down the house to change the drapes. For another thing, why do you think the voters

had to implement taxicab reform in the first place? Because the supervisors refused to!

VOTE NO ON P!

- The supervisors claim that cab drivers need to pay more fees. They pay adequate fees now.
- The supervisors claim that more cabs are needed, but current regulations allow more cabs when circumstances warrant.
- The supervisors claim that radio dispatching of cabs is needed, but radio dispatch has been required for all new cab permits since 1978.

Vote NO on the power grab! **VOTE NO ON P!**

No on Proposition P Committee
State Senator *Quentin L. Kopp*, Chairman

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P ARE ON PAGES 149 TO 151

Regulation of Taxicabs

P

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION P

They're at it again. Proposition P is the third attempt in ten years to repeal the landmark taxicab reform law (known as Proposition K) adopted by San Francisco voters in 1978. The most recent assault by the monied monopolists was rejected by a whopping 80% of the voters in 1981. Proposition P deserves the same fate.

Indeed, Proposition P is the most dangerous attack yet on the free enterprise and consumer protection provisions of taxicab reform. That's because Proposition P nakedly repeals our voter-approved taxicab law and leaves it to the Board of Supervisors to adopt a new ordinance. The big shots in the taxicab industry have twice failed to persuade the voters to scrap taxicab reform, after costing taxpayers thousands of dollars with an unsuccessful lawsuit to invalidate the reform. Now they're asking us to give the supervisors power to adopt any taxicab permit ordinance they want. They must be kidding.

VOTE NO PROPOSITION P.

Taxicab reform by you, the voter, stopped profiteering of cab

permits, which belong to the city. Proposition P would let the Board of Supervisors change that.

Taxicab reform allows cab drivers to charge less than the maximum fare. Proposition P would let the supervisors change that.

Taxicab reform sets strict standards for safe and adequate cab service throughout San Francisco. Proposition P would let the supervisors change that too.

In fact, Proposition P would let the supervisors do just about anything they want to our taxicab reform law, as long as they follow the so-called "principles" of Proposition K. And guess who would define what those "principles" are? The Board of Supervisors.

Preserve taxicab reform. Protect your decision on taxicab regulation.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION P.

No on Proposition P Committee

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Chairman

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION P

If you're completely satisfied with taxicab service in San Francisco, you won't support Proposition P. But, if you think that taxicab service can and should be improved, and that the City should do something to improve taxicab service, then you will VOTE FOR Proposition P.

The present law was adopted 10 years ago. It was the beginning of reform, not the end. Taxicab service can still be improved and Proposition P allows that to happen.

Look at the organizations that have submitted arguments in favor of Proposition P, including Self Help for the Elderly and the Inde-

pendent Living Resources Center: these are not "the monied monopolists". Don't be misled, a VOTE FOR Proposition P is a vote for reform. A vote against Proposition P is an endorsement of taxicab service as it is today.

VOTE FOR REFORM — VOTE FOR PROPOSITION P to make taxicab service more responsive and more available for everyone.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P ARE ON PAGES 151 & 152

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION P

ORDINANCE REPEALING PROPOSITION K, AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION OF TAXICABS AND OTHER MOTOR VEHICLES FOR HIRE SUBJECT TO THE ADOPTION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF A COMPREHENSIVE ORDINANCE FOR THE REGULATION OF TAXICABS AND MOTOR VEHICLES FOR HIRE.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and

County of San Francisco:

NOTE: Additions and substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ~~strike-out type~~.

Section 1. The qualified electors do hereby repeal Proposition K, adopted by the voters of the city and county on June 6, 1978, subject to, and effective upon the effective date of a comprehensive ordinance for the regulation of taxicabs and other motor vehicles for hire to be

adopted by the board of supervisors which will follow the principles of Proposition K, including but not limited to non-transferability of permits, promotion of owner-operators, mandatory dispatch and radio control of all taxis and such other measures as shall be found by the board of supervisors to be for the public convenience and necessity. □