

Taxicabs

I

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 central-

ized 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 186.



Taxicabs

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 867 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

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

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*

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



Taxicabs

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

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
José Villalobos
Wai Kong
Nelson Tam
R. Rodriguez
David Chow
Automotive Mechanics,
Local 1414*

*Al Tomas
Thomas Collins
George Amaya
Kenneth Noda
Mario Duarte
Ricardo Albert Hernandez
Brian Johansen, Teamsters
Local 665
Larry Mazzola, Business
Manager, Plumbers
Union, Local 38*

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*

Gay & Lesbian San Franciscans say NO on I

We have two major problems with Proposition I. First, it may require that taxi permit holders who may be unable to drive for any reason turn in their permits. This isn't fair to people who are sick or have a debilitating disease.

Second, Proposition I will mandate the creation of a "centralized dispatch system" that the City would operate and our neighborhoods don't want. According to the City Controllers statement on Proposition I, **if the City operates the taxi service it could result in a draw on the general fund or increases in taxi rates to cover the costs.** With the critical problems facing our neighborhoods it is amazing that this measure even made it to the ballot. We will not support having the general fund raided for a special interest that the City doesn't need.

Please join the Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club, Castro area merchants, residents and gay community leaders in voting NO on Proposition I.

*Community College Trustee Leslie Katz
Community College Trustee Lawrence Wong
Gerry Schluter, President*

*Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Kevin Piediacszi
Robert Barnes*

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*

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



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 Lazzareschi

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 Minolli

Patricia Manolli

Churchid Lewis

Max Kessler

John Howard

Duane Spurgeon

Richard Krile

Mary Warren

William Lazar

Luis Curiel

Paul Henerlan

Alfred Stone

Frank Lynch

Mary Speck

Emory Speck

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 conferring 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 that an entire new government bureaucracy be created 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 cahoots 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

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



Taxicabs

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, Visitation 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
Gwendolyn 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 Redd
San Francisco Housing Authority Commission

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 taxi 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 Hennessey
District Attorney Arlo Smith

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

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



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.

<i>Bill Nieboer</i>	<i>Allen Thompson</i>	<i>Ricardo Lopez</i>
<i>Michael Purcell</i>	<i>Joel Anderson</i>	<i>John Panages</i>
<i>David Murphy</i>	<i>David Do</i>	<i>Ronald Schafranek</i>
<i>Rocky Simpson</i>	<i>Gershman</i>	<i>Duncan Dong</i>
<i>Donald Alger</i>	<i>Charles Gale</i>	<i>Ron Zammataw</i>
<i>William Barnett</i>	<i>Raymond Mar</i>	<i>James Newsome</i>
<i>Carl Christensen</i>	<i>Jimmy Chang</i>	<i>Kavoos Kavoosi</i>
<i>John Law</i>	<i>Wei Lee</i>	<i>Tony Chu</i>
<i>Anthony Perez</i>	<i>John Ma</i>	<i>Albert Sugabo</i>
<i>James McCann</i>	<i>Gary Hom</i>	<i>Francis Gonzales</i>
<i>Sean Morgan</i>	<i>Jeff Harrison</i>	<i>John Diesso</i>
<i>Lawrence Orenstein</i>	<i>T. Robyn Muro</i>	<i>Frank de Mesa</i>
<i>Lonna Denny</i>	Yellow Cab Drivers	<i>Stan Marble</i>
<i>John Warren</i>	<i>Jerome Lynch</i>	<i>Bill Norton</i>
<i>Larry Alhadef</i>	<i>Edwin Jew</i>	<i>Jack Moreno</i>
<i>Ralph Deming</i>	<i>Willis Brozzi</i>	<i>Kwing Gee</i>
<i>Martin Moore</i>	<i>Rick Beal</i>	<i>Boris Rainer</i>
<i>Bob Johnston</i>	<i>Larry Rosenblatt</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.

Desoto

*Edward J. Scoble
Ricardo Manansala
Yellow Cab
Jose Medrano
Reynaldo Magno
Edwin Sayabyab
Benjamin Lisog
Rolando Marciales
Jimmy Abilar
Jack Majewski
Antonio Guerarra
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.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Brian Coop</i> | <i>Victor Bubbett</i> | <i>James McGlew</i> |
| <i>Brent Hauelsen</i> | <i>Jeff Ecker</i> | <i>Peter Lebares</i> |
| <i>Raymond Rodriguez</i> | <i>Gary Sartor</i> | <i>Herbert Grant</i> |
| <i>John Christopher</i> | <i>Michael McLaughlin</i> | <i>Richard Graham</i> |
| <i>Alfred Riggs</i> | <i>Essa Shatara</i> | <i>James Bottomoff</i> |
| <i>Richard Lubinski</i> | <i>Richard White</i> | <i>Willie Mays</i> |
| <i>Terry Hensley</i> | <i>Harb</i> | <i>Johnson</i> |
| <i>Kevin Doyle</i> | <i>Robert Friedman</i> | <i>Roy Glass</i> |
| <i>Naum Vaksman</i> | <i>Kim Olson</i> | <i>Suzanne Rathert</i> |
| <i>Kye Rorie, II</i> | <i>Larry V. Mitchell</i> | <i>Philip Anton</i> |
| <i>Craig Wilson</i> | <i>Jeffrey Wheeler</i> | <i>Kenneth Whipple</i> |
| <i>Michael Schwartz</i> | <i>Tara Shannon</i> | <i>Thomas Ferris</i> |
| <i>Luis Curiel</i> | <i>Paul Fernandez</i> | <i>Adam Cohen</i> |
| <i>Carlos Ramirez</i> | <i>Richard Cannon</i> | <i>David Mathews</i> |
| <i>Joseph Frank</i> | <i>Alan Gochberg</i> | <i>Lewis Jackson</i> |
| <i>Michael Gibbons</i> | <i>Rudy Robling</i> | <i>Michael Burns</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.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Jon Garin</i> | <i>Paul Ranieri</i> | <i>Steven d'Amelio</i> |
| <i>Al Thompson</i> | <i>Patrick Tibbatts</i> | <i>David Curiel</i> |
| <i>Jimmy Chang</i> | <i>J. Welsh</i> | <i>Howard Hill</i> |
| <i>Telos Tosen</i> | <i>Michael Lee</i> | <i>Richard Quigley</i> |
| <i>Eric Spillman</i> | <i>James Gray</i> | <i>Margo Bohlig</i> |
| <i>Ray Rex</i> | <i>Harry McCarthy</i> | <i>Robert Slivoski</i> |
| <i>Gary Pang</i> | <i>Paul Zmudzinski</i> | <i>D. Eymer</i> |
| <i>Aaron King</i> | <i>Peter Von Wiegandt</i> | <i>William Jones</i> |
| <i>Gerard Nolot</i> | <i>Rob Flores</i> | <i>Ernest Young</i> |
| <i>Miguel Cardona</i> | <i>Anthony Caruso</i> | <i>Raymond Rojo</i> |
| <i>Joseph Reney</i> | <i>larry Gee</i> | <i>Mohammed</i> |
| <i>Peter Sword</i> | <i>Douglas Spigner</i> | <i>Sherwani</i> |
| <i>Ricardo Roman</i> | <i>Alec Kaplan</i> | <i>Bernard Ross</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.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| DeSoto Cab | Metro | White and Blue |
| <i>C.H. Brown</i> | <i>Rich Vo</i> | <i>Hing Hom</i> |
| <i>Jason Nagota</i> | <i>Richard Hygels</i> | <i>Roland Hom</i> |
| <i>Damon Lindberg</i> | <i>James Bonser</i> | <i>Smilovitsky</i> |
| <i>Frank Sullivan</i> | Luxor | Veterans |
| <i>Ed Lehmann</i> | <i>Jim Sward</i> | <i>Matt Sutter</i> |
| <i>Julia Edwinson</i> | <i>Richard Koury</i> | <i>Shelley Burton</i> |
| <i>Hugh Fontaine</i> | <i>Chris Colon</i> | <i>Peter Fox</i> |
| <i>Tomm Perea</i> | <i>Richard Ellis</i> | <i>William Cline</i> |
| <i>Gordon F. Bell</i> | <i>Bachar</i> | <i>John Avery</i> |
| <i>Florentin Anghelescu</i> | <i>Ian McKeown</i> | <i>Austin Peterson</i> |
| <i>Robert Hartunian</i> | <i>Joel Wolk</i> | <i>Paul Taylor</i> |
| <i>William Field</i> | <i>Thomas Moore</i> | <i>Michael Turner</i> |
| <i>John Flarkey</i> | <i>Dan Pena</i> | <i>Stephen Phillips</i> |
| <i>Wing N. Tse</i> | <i>Warren Brunt</i> | <i>Jeff Coffin</i> |
| <i>Chad Pence</i> | <i>Johnny Ron</i> | <i>Mazen Hakooz</i> |
| <i>Wayne Rantanen</i> | <i>Philip Lellman</i> | <i>Walter Farrell</i> |
| <i>James Chan</i> | <i>Lalu Nuong</i> | <i>Bob Valdez</i> |
| <i>Albert Yambao</i> | <i>Kevin McNamee</i> | <i>Jonathon Chalich</i> |
| <i>Renata</i> | <i>M.D. Fredrick</i> | <i>Paul Christians</i> |
| <i>Wymiarkiewicz</i> | <i>Jim Marez</i> | <i>Gary Sharp</i> |
| <i>Glen Gray</i> | <i>Noel Pacter</i> | <i>Richard Loewen</i> |
| <i>Dan Hinds</i> | <i>Ron Balliet</i> | <i>Tito Dziensuwski</i> |
| <i>Mike Eaton</i> | <i>Ralph Craig</i> | <i>Ron Wolter</i> |
| <i>Bill Hunger</i> | <i>David Wagner</i> | <i>Ron Larry</i> |
| <i>Davd Brown</i> | <i>Edward Kass</i> | <i>Keith Harris</i> |
| National Cab | <i>Mark Powell</i> | <i>Joseph Warne</i> |
| <i>M. Fisherman</i> | <i>Damon Reilly</i> | <i>William Steinway</i> |
| <i>Bhadan Johal</i> | <i>Vasilios Margiannid</i> | <i>Bruce Randolph</i> |
| <i>Rafael Machkovsky</i> | <i>Ghanem Elmashni</i> | <i>Miller</i> |
| <i>Boris Smilovitsky</i> | <i>Sam Martinovsky</i> | <i>Edward Christen</i> |
| <i>Alex Shimmar</i> | <i>Dmitry Vaynshteyn</i> | <i>Bruno Anton</i> |
| <i>Torgunakov</i> | <i>Jeffrey Rapaport</i> | <i>Fred Anthony</i> |
| Blue Bird Cab | <i>Dale Fuller</i> | <i>Peter Varga</i> |
| <i>Troy Vo</i> | <i>Robert Conrad</i> | |
| <i>Sanh Phuenguyen</i> | <i>Mizan Rahman</i> | |
| <i>Mikhail Korolev</i> | <i>Joseph Barsse</i> | |
| <i>Vitaly Pikarevich</i> | | |

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

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 Erhail
Joseph Barsse
Richard Healy
Winfield McCoy
Daniel Coughlin
Robert Venegas
Louis Moss
Jaime Moreno
Claudio Alarcao
Robert Walker
Yard Feleke
Harold Duhon
Terrence Edenborg
Tony Lama

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

DeSoto Cab

Ray De Pucci
Francis Wilson
Robert Thein
Donald Blane
Joseph Sierra
Austin Rogers
Almer Faust
Bernard Ross
Jack Maniaci
Rick Johansen
Dave Alderman
A. Rsutemi

Peter Linehan
Joseph Palella
Phil Sterlin
Paul Mitchell
William Lum
Joseph Lorenzo
Thomas Toumajan
Michael Travis
Michael Williams
Tom Casey
Ricci Sims
Charles Speidel
Mustafa
P. Baumgarten
Anwari
Charles Rolling
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 Lansdown
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 Ribeiro
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
Mohsen Hassan
Kurt P. Brecht
Osama M. Awwad
A. Sinaiko
Morris Fong
Solomon
Michael Davenport
John Boyles
Humberto Espinosa
Mazen Alkilani



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.

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Sunshine | <i>T.O. Loewenstein</i> | <i>Vladimir Leyrin</i> |
| <i>Louie Herrada</i> | <i>Joe Brozello</i> | <i>Ed Bennett</i> |
| <i>Roberto Sanz</i> | <i>Tony Desimonia</i> | Checker Cab |
| Diamond | <i>J. Howard Kelley</i> | <i>Lipicij</i> |
| <i>Tran</i> | <i>Ross Carpenter</i> | <i>Traub</i> |
| Falcon | <i>Paul V. Ridley</i> | Bay Cab |
| <i>Guy Wong</i> | <i>Gwendolyn Flash</i> | <i>Joseph</i> |
| City Cab | <i>York Tober</i> | <i>Borukhovich</i> |
| <i>Julio Postiglione</i> | <i>Keith Fazackerley</i> | Universal Cab |
| <i>Muuwiyah Alshriedeh</i> | <i>W.S. Johnson</i> | <i>Viktor Morgulis</i> |
| <i>Romeo Shairaly</i> | <i>David Ackers</i> | SF Cab |
| <i>Francine Wiley</i> | <i>Thomas</i> | <i>Trin</i> |
| <i>Joseph Teixieka</i> | <i>Stanchellini</i> | Other Drivers |
| <i>R. William Vega</i> | <i>Khamatovsky</i> | <i>Charles Walker</i> |
| <i>Michael Levin</i> | <i>Stasman Dina</i> | <i>Jose Labrador</i> |
| <i>George Fields</i> | United Cab | <i>Barry K. Taranto</i> |
| <i>Richard Gilmour</i> | <i>Grigory</i> | <i>Bill Minikel</i> |
| <i>Charles Beauvals</i> | <i>Lubarsky</i> | <i>John</i> |
| <i>Nollie Griffin</i> | <i>Jaswinder Mann</i> | <i>Chmielewski</i> |
| <i>Madeleine Fisher</i> | <i>Peter Ho</i> | |
| <i>Bill Kanios</i> | <i>Vancam Vo</i> | |

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 taxicab 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

San Francisco Democratic Party Opposes Proposition I

Proposition I does not reform the taxicab 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

Lulu M. Carter

Lee Ann Prifti

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 taxicab dispatch system in good health. Vote NO on Proposition I!

Norman Mangibuyat, Pharmacy Technician,
Davies Medical Center

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

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