

Taxicab Permits



PROPOSITION M

Shall City law be amended to authorize issuance of restricted taxicab permits in the names of one or more persons, and to set a full-time driving or operating requirement for permit-holders at 800 hours per year?

YES



NO



Digest

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A 1978 initiative ordinance sets rules for how the City issues taxicab permits. A Charter Amendment passed by the voters in 1998 created a Taxi Commission appointed by the Mayor.

A permit may be issued only to an individual person. A permit may not be issued to a business, partnership or corporation. Permit-holders personally must drive the taxicab for at least four (4) hours a day on 75 percent of business days in a year, currently interpreted as 156 shifts.

Although the 1978 ordinance does not specifically provide for restricted permits, the City does issue permits for wheelchair-accessible taxis.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would amend the 1978 initiative ordinance governing taxicab permits by authorizing the Taxi Commission to issue special permits. Ownership of these permits would not be restricted to an individual person, but could be issued to two or more persons. These permits could be issued for:

- wheelchair-accessible taxis;
- transportation emergencies;
- taxis operated only during certain business hours, such as "peak time";
- taxis operated only in certain areas such as neighborhood-only, City only, or Airport-only.
- Fleet-taxis

The Board of Supervisors or the Taxi Commission would define and set the restrictions on these special permits.

Permit-holders would be required to operate the permit for at least 800 hours each year. The Board of Supervisors or the Taxi Commission would decide what taxi-related activities, other than driving, counted as operation.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the City's taxicab laws.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

Should the proposed ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would have little or no impact on the City's General Fund, but it would likely increase the level of administrative and enforcement costs required of the City's fee-supported taxi regulation efforts.

How "M" Got on the Ballot

On August 9th, 2000 the Department of Elections received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Becerril, Brown, Kaufman, Leno, Teng, Yaki, and Yee.

The City Election Code allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

THIS MEASURE REQUIRES 50%+1 AFFIRMATIVE VOTES TO PASS.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT BEGINS ON PAGE P-193
SOME OF THE WORDS USED IN THE BALLOT DIGEST ARE EXPLAINED ON PAGE P-2

M

Taxicab Permits

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Everyone knows that getting a taxi, especially in the outer neighborhoods, is difficult. Although we have put more taxis on the street in the past few years, service for neighborhood residents, seniors and the disabled is still not adequate. It is next to impossible to get a cab to promptly respond to calls from the Sunset, Excelsior, the Bayview and other outlying neighborhoods. These communities desperately require expanded, enhanced taxi service.

Proposition M is a straightforward measure that will give our Taxi Commission the ability to improve taxi service, particularly in low income and outer neighborhoods. The Commission would have the ability to **issue permits for:**

- Wheelchair accessible taxis;
- Transportation emergencies;
- Peak times;
- Neighborhood taxis;
- Airport taxis.

Proposition M requires that all new permits go to experienced members of the taxicab industry, ensuring that permits are held and operated by those who know the City and its transportation needs.

Proposition M integrates taxi service into our Transit First

goals by ensuring taxis are a real public transportation option.

Proposition M protects the City's ability to **stabilize and expand wheelchair taxi permits**, that are prohibited under current law and subject to legal challenge.

Proposition M, like current law, **prohibits transfer or sale of taxi permits** and prohibits issuance of any permit to a corporation, company or partnership.

Our neighborhoods deserve better taxi service. Let's give our Taxi Commission the ability to create innovative, progressive new programs that will improve service. Proposition M makes these improvements possible. We are in favor of bringing taxis to the neighborhoods where they are needed. You can help by **voting Yes on Proposition M.**

Mayor Willie Brown

Supervisor Alicia Becerril

Supervisor Amos Brown

Supervisor Leslie Katz

Supervisor Barbara Kaufman

Supervisor Mark Leno

Supervisor Mabel Teng

Supervisor Michael Yaki

Supervisor Leland Yee

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is an attempted cynical manipulation of the riding public which **will not**, as promised, result in better service. This confusing measure can be summarized thus:

It **won't** put more cabs on the streets. That's the Taxi Commission's job.

It **won't** improve an inefficient dispatch system. That's the job of cab companies.

It **will** reward those same companies by giving them their own permits.

The Commission can authorize any of the specialized permits listed in the proponents' argument. But, the proponent conveniently fails to mention one class of permits this proposition would newly authorize: **fleet permits.**

Current law says that all permits must go to drivers, not to companies. Proposition M would allow them to go to companies and allow them an exemption from the present driving requirement.

The proponents of Proposition M claim that wheelchair-accessible ramp taxis are currently prohibited. **But, sixty-five wheelchair-accessible ramp cabs, authorized under the Municipal Code, are now in service.**

As City officials, we are dedicated to achieving the best taxi service possible. More cabs, and a plan for better response time can achieve that goal. Proposition M can't. Instead, it will give a windfall to companies and hurt cab drivers.

We urge you to vote **NO.**

Supervisor Gavin Newsom

Supervisor Tom Ammiano

Supervisor Sue Bierman

Taxi Commissioner Paul Gillespie

Taxi Commissioner Mary McGuire

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

Taxicab Permits



OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is the seventh cab company attack on the governing law of the San Francisco taxi industry, Proposition K of 1978. As in the past, this attempt is not about service, it's about profits and power.

As co-chair of the Mayor's Taxi Task Force, I became intimately familiar with the workings of the taxi industry and the problems of taxi service. The Task Force adopted over 50 recommendations to address those problems, among them the creation of a Taxi Commission with ample powers to improve service. The Commission has issued over 300 more taxi permits, **including wheelchair-accessible taxis**, with almost 100 more on the way. This fall, I will encourage the Taxi Commission to issue even more.

Proposition K called for the issuance of as many permits as are needed to provide good cab service. It allows for different kinds of permits to be issued, including permits for wheelchair-accessible ramp taxis, neighborhood taxis, and others supposedly authorized by Proposition M. Proposition K promoted better

customer service by giving service providers a share in profits: permits can only be issued to full-time drivers. If Proposition M passes, permit holders wouldn't even have to drive a taxi!

This partial repeal of Proposition K is replete with vague and confusing language which company representatives could not or would not clarify, including a provision allowing for the issuance of a new class of "fleet permits," and other provisions allowing for companies, rather than individuals, to control permits.

Proposition M short-circuits the reforms begun by the Task Force. If it passes, the losers will be the riding public who were misled to think it would result in better taxicab service. Instead of improving service, needed reforms would fall by the wayside in this cab company grab for profits.

Supervisor Gavin Newsom

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Are you able to get a cab when and where you need one? If you live in the Richmond, West Portal, OMI, Bayview Hunters Point or the Sunset, can you really rely on taxis for your transportation needs?

Taxi service in our City's outlying neighborhoods is scarce at best. Unfortunately, until Proposition M, neighborhood transportation needs have been ignored.

Proposition M will give the Taxi Commission the ability to issue permits that could specifically serve outlying and low income neighborhoods that currently lack taxi service. If this is already possible as Supervisor Newsom asserts, why haven't such permits been issued to serve those neighborhoods? ***Now is the opportunity for real solutions -- not empty rhetoric.***

Proposition M furthers the reform process begun by the Mayor's Taxi Task Force and the establishment of the Taxi

Commission, giving them real ability to make real change that benefits neighborhood residents.

If you are not happy with the taxi service in your neighborhood, ***Support Proposition M for real taxi service reform.***

Mayor Willie Brown

Supervisor Alicia Becerril

Supervisor Amos Brown

Supervisor Leslie Katz

Supervisor Barbara Kaufman

Supervisor Mabel Teng

Supervisor Michael Yaki

Supervisor Leland Yee

M

Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

THE GOLDEN GATE RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS PROP M FOR BETTER NEIGHBORHOOD TAXI SERVICE

The Golden Gate Restaurant Association strongly supports Proposition M, a reasonable, straightforward measure that will help improve taxi service, particularly to the City's outer neighborhoods. Too few taxis to serve restaurant customers and our staff has been a top issue for our Association. Despite successfully getting more cabs on the street in the last few years, service to neighborhood businesses is still woefully inadequate.

Proposition M simply gives the Taxicab Commission the ability to address taxi service needs of our neighborhoods through specialized permits if necessary.

While we should all be proud of San Francisco's reputation as the #1 restaurant city in the world, our cab service is regularly criticized by visitors and locals alike. Visitors can't get back to their hotels after visiting some of our fine neighborhood restaurants. Better cab service would also relieve parking pressures in neighborhoods if diners are confident of getting a cab. In addition, our staff often needs to take a cab home late at night for safety reasons. Yet, even at 1:00am they cannot rely on a cab to take them home in a reasonable time frame, especially from businesses in outer neighborhoods.

The lack of adequate cab service is unacceptable and harms our City's international reputation. The GGRA supported the creation of the Taxi Commission as a first step toward making San Francisco a world-class cab city. Prop M gives the Taxi Commission the ability to put more cabs on the street and more cabs in our neighborhoods. Let's become a city where you can "cab it" to your favorite neighborhood restaurant.

Join the GGRA in supporting Proposition M.

Golden Gate Restaurant Association

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the Golden Gate Restaurant Association PAC.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Southern Wine and Spirits of Northern California 2. Golden Gate Restaurant Association 3. Scoma's, Sausalito.

More taxis equals Better Service. Who opposes this measure? The taxi medallion holders (the current permit holders) they are claiming that big corporations will benefit. However, corporations **don't own any medallions**- they're not allowed to have them. Companies like Yellow *are a co-op*, that's **owned by the drivers**. The opponents are actually the current medallion holders. They **simply don't want more competition**.

This measure was put on by consumers that want better service.

Adam Sparks

GOP Candidate for Congress, San Francisco

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Adam Sparks.

The Bayview Hunters Point Community Supports Prop M For Better Cab Service!

The Bayview Hunters Point community is simply not served by taxis. Drivers do not pick up calls and do not drive the streets of our neighborhood looking for passengers. Our community is ignored and isolated, as taxis flock downtown, stranding our residents and forcing them to rely on restricted MUNI schedules.

Prop M can help bring taxi service to our community. As one of the City's fastest changing neighborhoods, Bayview Hunters Point must rely on crucial transportation services such as taxis to help our community grow and flourish. Prop M will give the Taxi Commission the ability to issue neighborhood permits to serve our community as well as other outlying neighborhoods that remain isolated.

We support Prop M and its goal to bring taxi service to all of San Francisco's neighborhoods!

Melvin Washington, President, Bayview Merchants Association
Dwayne Robinson, Executive Director, Bayview Barber College

The true source of funds used to pay for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxicab Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Senior and Disabled Leaders Support Prop M

Prop M finally legalizes the City's ramp or wheelchair accessible taxis. For too many years, this important program that provides seniors and the disabled with transportation options other than MUNI has been subject to legal challenge, because restricted permits, such as ramp taxis, are prohibited under current taxi law.

Isn't it time this program is brought into compliance with the American's with Disabilities Act and ramp taxis are awarded the same protections regular taxi permits are? We think so. Prop M ensures that this program no longer exists under the cloud of possible legal challenge.

Protect the City's wheelchair taxi program by voting Yes on Prop M.

*FDR Democratic Club for Persons with Disabilities and Seniors
August Longo
Alyce G. Brown
Leonard L. Brown*

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Community Leaders Support Better Neighborhood Taxi Service

San Francisco's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender community supports putting more taxis in our City's neighborhoods. As a progressive City, we discourage the use of private automobiles and encourage the use of alternative public transportation. Yet, the availability of taxis in our neighborhoods is unreliable at best. Prop M gives residents real transportation options, moves us a step closer to making taxis a real component of our City's Transit First policy, and encourages greater use of taxis by all residents.

Give the Taxi Commission the ability to improve neighborhood taxi service. Vote Yes on Prop M.

*Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Wayne Friday, Police Commissioner
Paul M. Hogan, Alice B. Toklas PAC Co-Chair
Anna Damiani*

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

San Francisco Taxicab Drivers Support Prop M

As San Francisco taxicab drivers, we support Proposition M because it will help the Taxi Commission reform the taxicab industry. Proposition M will give drivers the flexibility to drive better shifts, such as Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights schedules when drivers can earn better money. Proposition M will move drivers who are on the waiting list for a taxi medallion, closer to obtaining one. **As taxi drivers, we support Proposition M, it is the next step in taxicab industry reform!**

*David Fernandez
Ahmed Abdulkader
Frank Chan
David Stefani
Asfaw Tedia
Christopher Ulich
Cao Hoang Minh
Mr. Rosenblum
Mr. Marinov
Luis Curiel
Roger Cardenas*

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

M

Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Democratic Leaders Support Prop M for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service

Prop M will ensure that all San Francisco's neighborhoods are served by taxis. Prop M gives the Taxi Commission the ability to issue special permits that will provide better service to Bayview Hunters Point, the Sunset, West Portal, the Richmond, Western Addition, Excelsior and Ingleside neighborhoods to name just a few. Every neighborhood outside downtown needs more taxis.

Prop M is a straightforward measure that can finally make a difference in taxi service. **For too long, our City's outer and low income neighborhoods have not been able to use taxis as a real public transportation option.** Prop M will give our neighborhoods this desperately needed option by allowing the Taxi Commission to finally address neighborhood service needs. Let's give the Commission the ability to try some innovative solutions that can help bring taxis to underserved communities.

We urge you to support Prop M for innovative, progressive solutions!

Supervisor Leslie Katz

Alex Wong, Chair, Asian Pacific Democratic Club

Dean Goodwin, Co-Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian, Gay Democratic Club

Lee Ann Prifti, Alice B. Toklas Executive Board

Juanita Owens, member, Democratic County Central Committee

Tom Hsieh, Supervisor Candidate, District 4

Dennis Herrera, member, Democratic County Central Committee

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

Small Business Leaders Support Prop M

We've all experienced the frustration of trying to call or flag down a taxicab. Unfortunately, in our City they are too few and far between. That hurts our small neighborhood businesses, the economic backbone of our City.

As longtime residents and business owners from every district of San Francisco, we know how crucial taxis are for our customers. Many of our customers are elderly and too frail to ride a MUNI bus home with their packages. They often rely on taxis as their only form of transportation. But too often, taxis simply aren't available to take these customers home. In addition, many of our employees use taxis to take them home late at night after work, when it is just not safe to take the bus or walk.

Prop M will help ensure that neighborhood businesses aren't ignored in favor of passengers at downtown businesses. **Prop M will help our small businesses survive by putting cabs in our neighborhoods - where they are needed!**

Please join us voting Yes on Prop M.

Melvin Washington, President, Bayview Merchants Association

Stephen Cornell, President, Brownies Hardware

Philip DeAndrade, Owner, Goat Hill Pizza

Adam Sparks, GOP Candidate for Congress

Arthur Bruzzone, Past Chair, SF Republican Party

Dwayne Robinson, Executive Director, Bayview Barber College

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

Taxicab Permits



PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Current and Former Taxi Commissioners Support Prop M

As current and former members of the San Francisco Taxi Commission, we have worked hard over the past two years to improve taxi service for the entire City. While the Commission recently voted to put 100 more taxis on the street, neighborhoods remain underserved.

Prop M is a straightforward measure that simply gives the Commission the ability to issue more restricted use permits, should the Commission determine that is necessary. The Commission must still hold public hearings on any proposal it puts forth and welcomes and encourages public input.

The voters approved the creation of the Taxicab Commission two years ago. While the Commission has made great strides in reforming certain areas of outdated taxi law, its hands have been tied by those same laws that limit its ability to make real substantive improvements in service, particularly to our City's outer neighborhoods. Prop M will give the Commission the ability, if necessary, to issue permits for:

- *peak times taxis;*
- *transportation emergencies; and*
- *neighborhood and airport only taxis.*

We hope you'll join us in taking a step toward real reform and real improvements in service:

Join us in voting Yes on Proposition M.

Rachialle Franklin, Vice President, Taxi Commission

Vincent Agbayani, Taxi Commissioner

Jane Bolig, Former Taxi Commissioner

Chris Dittenhafer, Former Taxi Commissioner

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.

Proposition M makes the driving requirement for permit holders flexible. Prop M allows a permit holder driver to take a family or medical leave without the fear of losing their taxicab permit: Under current law, a permit holder who becomes ill or disabled for longer than three months loses their taxicab permit. That's just not fair to hard working drivers. Vote Yes on M, it will help drivers that need medical or family leave.

John Vo

Thong Minh Cao

William Tickle

Hai Van Nguyen

Philip Lellman

Mike Dashti

Donald Mitchell

Domingo Opolakia

Roger Cardenas

Roberto Hernandez

John Ballentine

Mike Garza

Victoria Thompson

Cao Huang

Cesar Ascarrunz

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Coalition for Better Neighborhood Taxi Service.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Yellow Cab Cooperative 2. Luxor Cab 3. National Cab.



Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco needs better taxi service but Proposition M is not about service; it is about corporate and political power over working men and women, mostly minorities who have waited years for the opportunity of medallion ownership and a better life. Prop. M will give the Taxi Commission and Board of Supervisors broad authority to bypass hundreds of independent drivers and issue specialized permits to corporations, partnerships or individuals who are not even on the waiting list! Proposition M is vague and misleading. Why would powerful taxi companies finance a riders' bill of rights? The lion does not give the lamb a bill of rights. The cab companies can improve their services anytime and the Taxi Commission and Board of Supervisors have the power they need to improve service. Vote NO on Proposition M. San Francisco needs more independent drivers, not less to produce better service for everyone.

Mike DeNunzio

Supervisorial Candidate, District Three

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Mike DeNunzio.

IF PROP M WINS, YOU LOSE! Worse cab service, higher fares, and the cab companies are laughing all the way to the bank. Vote No on Prop M.

David Spero

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is David Spero.

The Taxi Commission should be issuing medallions to drivers on the waiting list now, but Proposition M gives them to corporations instead.

This is the seventh attempt by greedy cab companies to take medallions away from drivers.

Vote NO on Prop M!

Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the Harvey Milk Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Democratic Club.

There is a service problem, but Prop M was not designed to solve it. Prop M is about Corporate Welfare, Fleet Medallions, and dead-end jobs for drivers. That is why Big Cab Companies are gambling 1/2 million dollars to promote it.

Prop M is riddled with vague terms and double meanings, placed in key areas for confusion. To the delight of lawyers and consultants, it's badly written and insures years of litigation.

If the Big Cab Companies truly cared about good service, we would have it today. Almost all the so-called improvements in M can be implemented by today's Taxi Commission - **except company Fleet Medallions!**

For instance, we could have centralized dispatch, where a call reaches every cab in the city - an enormous increase in service. Only the Big Cab Companies stand in the way of centralized dispatch, a system that might cost them money - but Prop M and Fleet Medallions would make them money - so much money, that it's worth their 1/2 million dollar gamble.

With Prop M and Fleet Medallions, drivers would have dead-end jobs and San Francisco would lose its finest drivers.

Let's send a strong message to the Big Cab Companies and reject their 1/2 million dollar boondoggle. Let's tell them that we want **real** solutions to service - solutions that can be done today, without sacrificing career drivers for Corporate Welfare. Let's continue our 22 year practice of giving medallions to the drivers who have earned them.

Vote NO on M.

James Maddox

President, SF Taxi Permitholder and Drivers Association

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the San Francisco Taxi Permitholder and Drivers Association, Inc.

The permit applicants' list is the seniority system for the taxicab industry. The prospect of getting a taxicab permit is the drivers' only benefit and is the reason good drivers stay in the industry. This measure would authorize the city to ignore the seniority system and to award blocks of permits to corporations. This would be a reversal of city policy which presently mandates that permits be held by taxicab drivers.

Proposition M is a stab in the back to working drivers who have played by the rules and have stayed on the job many years waiting for their turn to get a permit of their own. Protect the drivers and support our progressive taxicab structure. Vote NO on this power grab.

Cliff Lundberg

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Cliff Lundberg.

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

Taxicab Permits



PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The Taxi Commission can improve taxi service now. Prop M is NOT NEEDED. Prop M is a classic example of lobbyists circumventing public will with no public review.

Hank Wilson

Candidate, Supervisor District 6

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Hank Wilson.

We, the wheelchair-access ramped-van taxicab drivers want nothing more than world-class cab service for our world-class city -- we want you to get a cab anytime you need one. But Prop M -- poorly thought-out, hastily written, intentionally convoluted and vague -- will NOT improve service to anyone. M is bad for everyone -- written without industry collaboration -- and worst of all, bad for cab service.

M is riddled with inefficiencies. **Imagine empty cabs not being allowed to pick you up when they are not in their designated neighborhood/airport areas!**

Please join us and members of the disabled community and **VOTE NO on M.**

Ramped Van Taxicab Permit Holders Association

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the Ramped Van Taxicab Permit Holders Association.

Proposition K of 1978, authored by then-Supervisor Quentin Kopp, had two purposes: 1) to create an industry of owner-drivers, thereby promoting better service, and 2) to end the corrupting influence of big cab company money on city politics.

Now, cab companies are trying to change Prop K to create a new class of permits -- "fleet permits"-- a euphemism for the corporate permits companies have coveted ever since K was passed. They're claiming that this would improve service. **Don't be fooled! Proposition M is not about service. It's about the allocation of taxi operating licenses.**

If cab companies were truly interested in service, they'd use the half-million dollars they're spending on manipulating public opinion and buying political support, and use it for improving service. Like picking up their phones when you call.

Yes, we need more taxis. But cab permits should go to owner-drivers, many being long-time veterans of the industry whose applications have been tied up in City Hall for more than a decade, not to companies which make you wait 30 minutes to an hour "on hold" and are rude to customers who complain.

Despite what their glossy mailers say, **Proposition M is not about service. It's about greed. Vote NO.**

Rose Tsai

Candidate for Supervisor, District 1

John Shanley

Candidate for Supervisor, District 4

Clint Reilly

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

M Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The following San Francisco cab drivers oppose Proposition M, a greedy cab company attempt to profit at their drivers' expense:

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Frank Fahy | Zareh Soghikian | Cliff Lundberg |
| James Nakamura | Wahid Abaelhawa | Kevin Conley |
| Admassu Mekbeb | G.L. Duff | Anastassios Karagiorgos |
| Gregory Neyman | Harry Garver | Edgar Graham |
| Robley Logan | Gregory Murray | Margo Bohlig |
| Seyran Amzayan | E.B. Federman | Tom Minjiras |
| Evong Ligu | Quang Quacht | Andrew Green |
| Sulinder Parmar | Martin Plascencia | Mohammad Khan |
| Sulaiman Asghar | Asifuddin Syed | Barry Taranto |
| Joseph Fleischman | James Maddox | Chris Glover |
| Robert Keller | Edgar Drake | Jeff Harrison |
| Stephen Webb | Brennan Walsh | Roderick Wallace |
| Aleksandr Pasko | Hugh Jones | Essa Shatans |
| David Outhouse | David Bahar | Tasafipi Hassine |
| Steven Doherty | Arturo Reyes | Manuel Veyna |
| Thomas Sherrod | Paul Schivani | Lawrence Dean |
| Kim Smith | Philip Gangi | Walter Long |
| Adil Fatteh | Koher Deisieh | Abdelhak Chiker |
| Charles Korbel | Fabrizio Barillas | Jaime Meza |
| Jon Boell | Sami Tlich | Konstantin Popov |
| Ronald Wolter | Adel Gasmelseed | Lon Parker |
| Rajan Bhardwaz | Joseph Cole | Jerome Ikpeana |
| Phillip Schelly | Michael Purcell | Ryan Graybebe |
| Robert Migdal | Patrick Fritch | J. Coates |
| William Plaisant | Ehab Elayyan | Martin Moore |
| Paul Lobell | B.C. Chimezie | Ralph Conforti |
| Slimane Cherif-Hminat | Jim McCann | Mike Rauls |
| Michael Estrada | Dennis Parish | A. Salangang |
| Amine Jenai | Albert Perkins | Roman Rudovsky |
| Luis SanGabriel | Manny Fernandez | Mary McGuire |
| Waverly Logan | Joseph Nancy | Bradford Baker |
| Arif AlEnizy | Lauren Shapiro | Jim Njama |
| Bezi Walid | Roy McFall | Robert Friedman |
| Dennis Lee | James Crowley | Terrance Early |
| Pascal Bouchet | Kamel Barakat | Joe Borzello |
| Mike Kelly | Deepak Kharb | Lewis Jackson |
| Nuru Tahire | Don Ueiez | Omar Barkaoui |
| Mario DeOliveira | Fess Richmond | Paul Dykstra |
| Allen Gelder | Peter Fox | Morgan Moore |
| John Donnelly | Matthew Rabinowitz | Philip Hacikett |
| Patrick Helland | Jim Hahn | Guss Foreman |
| Val Cartoun | Harkirat Bath | Ram Tirath |
| Mohammad Shalimani | Tsegaye Abera | Alan Freberg |
| Charles Dixie | Dara Rakkar | Nasir Khan |
| Darren Harris | Tarlochan Singh | |

Committee Against Permit Profiteering

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

The following San Francisco cab drivers oppose Proposition M, a greedy cab company attempt to profit at their drivers' expense:

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| William Yee | Evan Goodler | Ken Gin |
| Fitsum Mender | Carlos Arboleda | ThaiHonz |
| Kenny Warren | Sarjeets Cheeiva | Ruach Graffis |
| Shelley Burton | James Ingram | Austin Peterson |
| Trevor Salgadoe | William Steinway | Roger Miozza |
| Ballayette Hassain | Sergei Limansky | Alan Ries |
| Sunil Kumpil | Mohammed Naeem | Lakhwinder Pal |
| Mekonnen Zere | Sayfulla Shalar | Mohamad Aibawayah |
| David Barlow | Johns Akinbodunse | Chirackal Abison |
| Hany Jelassi | Manuel Cuelho | Louis Pofi |
| Jeff Coffin | Terry Allen | Basheer Abdul |
| Jennifer Farruggia | Robert Wickey | Emir Castillo |
| Bob Johnston | Fernando Buenafeor | T. Dziensuwski |
| James Knight | Bhupendra Palet | Jacques Gruber |
| Claudio Pimentia | Jay Hall | Roman Antonov |
| Phillippe Sterlin | Gerald Cassidy | Frank Sinkavich |
| Don Anderson | Edwin Santiago | David Brown |
| Iwge Dhillon | Aguero DeCastro | Sai Lee |
| Herbert Gee | Frances Wilson | David Haase |
| Richard Hart | Bela Harcos | Goshi Kogure |
| Ed Burke | Ghanem Elmashni | Louis Ameril |
| Jeff Ecker | Jessica Gorton | Larry Vickers |
| Donald Laird | Jack Johnstone | Keith Harris |
| Lee Secapure | John Curtin | Phillip Anton |
| Tai Nguyen | Michael Schildknecht | Nourebaine Maadouf |
| V.J. Aunola | Gary Sartor | Gerald Goldie |
| Thomas Hallford | Kevin Dorning | Michael Gibbons |
| Eric Hansen | Mike Mahayni | Walter Morgan |
| Kenneth Whipple | Ernesto Diali | Chris French |
| Tom Whelan | Mohammed Eddine | Khaled Abdelvaby |
| Dzmitry Nazaran | David Blood | Mark Kogan |
| Francis Fox | Charles Carthern | David Murphy |
| James Boldman | Marc Baxter | John Law |
| George Haza | Bernard Francisco | Arnold Nelson |
| Thomas Ferris | Mark Gruberg | David Herman |
| Richmond Loewinsohn | Isaac Yohannes | Tara Housman |
| John Cambell | Richard Koury | Donald Templeton |
| Victoria Lansdown | Theodore Gray | T. Winz |
| Alan DaSilva | Rudy Galindo | Alex Malinsky |
| James Panther | Shawn Nguyen | Ali Golparast |
| Gaber Shalaby | Medi Doroudian | Raymond Chiu |
| Kathleen Hughes | Neil Gralnick | David Chan |
| Philip Larson | Gregory Goble | Issa Elghazawi |
| George Minarik | Kam Po Chan | Cynthia Snowden |
| Narinder Singh | Joseph Palella | Clarence Fisher |

Committee Against Permit Profiteering

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

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

Taxicab Permits

M

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco tenants should oppose Proposition M for the same reason they oppose ordinances favoring landlords: **Proposition M gives to the haves at the expense of the have-nots.**

Cab drivers are overwhelmingly renters, and consistently support tenants' rights. Tenants should stand by cab drivers because they are our natural allies against the forces of greed. Don't let cab companies strip long-time drivers of the chance at a taxicab permit, the only protection they have.

Vote NO on M.

Ted Gullicksen

San Francisco Tenants Union

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

Nothing in Proposition M will improve service to *either* the **disability** community or the general public. Many in the taxicab industry have been working hard to improve service-- over the past 15 years the size of the city's fleet has nearly doubled and the number of ramp vans available to serve the **disabled** community has risen from 0 to 65. We fear Prop M will stifle such improvements, to enrich just a few cab companies.

Vote NO on Proposition M.

Sergio Alunan

President, Disability Community Democratic Club

Luis Calderon

Chair, CIAPA — Consumers in Action for Personal Assistance

Bruce Oka

Oka and Associates

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

Need better service? Then Vote No on Proposition M. Demand that the voter-created Taxi Commission do its job and create a centralized dispatch system.

Let's stop this endless power grab by the taxi companies and do the right thing to help drivers and passengers.

San Francisco Tomorrow

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is San Francisco Tomorrow.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Jane Morrison 2. Jennifer Clary 3. Claude Wilson.

Quentin L. Kopp's Former Staff Urge You to Vote 'No' on M!

Having served as staff members assigned to the taxicab issue for former State Senator and San Francisco Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp, the author of Proposition K in 1978, we urge you to vote against this insidious measure. Its deceitful language makes it appear that it would improve taxicab service. What a hoax! The singular purpose of Proposition M is to place additional taxicab permits in the hands of bloated taxicab corporations, so they can make millions of dollars from city-issued permits. That's why they're spending \$500,000 to try to impose this measure on unsuspecting voters. Proposition K, the 1978 voter-approved initiative requires that permits issued after that time be in the hands of only bona-fide taxicab drivers. Prop M would change that provision by contriving a new type of fleet permit and other types of permits that could be issued to corporations. These permits would have to be "operated" -- not driven -- by their owners. That means the owners would not have to be taxicab drivers and could be anybody with City Hall connections who wishes to profiteer from city-issued permits which are the public's property. Taxicab service can be improved; actual reforms could be promulgated by the Taxicab Commission without an initiative ordinance wasting voter's time. The proponents of this measure don't want improvements; they want money and corporate control. It's pure and simple -- **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M and honor the will of the people.**

Julie Ann Sim

Kevin Nguyen

John Shanley

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Good Government Alliance.

The largest contributor to the true source recipient committee is 1. Kopp Good Government Committee.



Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M - MONUMENTAL MONEY GRAB

The "M" in this measure stands for MONEY!

One respected San Francisco newspaper put it best describing this stealth proposition as: "The Taxi-Industry Scam." Proposition M is an admitted (by its corporate sponsors) \$500,000 win-at-all-costs campaign effort to undermine the 1978 voter initiative reforming the issuance of taxicab permits -- **permits which are governmental license and not private property.** The 1978 initiative prohibits the sale of taxi permits for private gain and upon a permit-holder's death or abandonment of a permit, requires its reissuance to a verified genuine driver, not a sale for tens of thousands of dollars by the lawyers, doctors, car salesmen, butchers and homemakers who previously owned and then leased out permits as private assets. It also requires every permit-holder to be a full-time driver. Proposition M is the eighth attempt since 1978 by the gluttonous cab companies to nullify that voter-embraced reform, Proposition M allows the servile Taxicab Commission to issue permits to corporations instead of verified, authentic full-time drivers and abolishes driving requirements for permit holders. Another respected San Francisco newspaper has observed: "Rather than stating that the taxi company-sponsored initiative on this November's ballot is just the latest taxicab company attempt to gain the right to hoard permits, the initiative is sneaky." Seven craven supervisors (names upon request), NOT VOTERS, placed this fraudulent "initiative" on the ballot. One supervisor, Yee, shamefully added his name, probably for campaign contributions. As that aforementioned newspaper concluded about Proposition M, "It's a mean piece of sentiment-milking, money-grabbing fraud, and San Franciscans should vote it down. We strongly agree. **Vote NO on M.**"

Mara Kopp
 Fred J. Martin Jr
 Dan Dunnigan
 Good Government Alliance

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Good Government Alliance.

The largest contributor to the true source recipient committee is:
 1. Kopp Good Government Committee.

Proposition M is another in a long series of cab company attempts to hoodwink the public into allowing them to grab off city-owned taxicab permits that would otherwise go to working cab drivers. If not for the half-million dollars behind it, Proposition M wouldn't even be on the ballot.

Under current law, taxi medallions must go to cab drivers, not companies. Proposition M's devious language would authorize the issuance of "FLEET PERMITS" to companies. Here's how it would work:

Our current law, Proposition K, says "No permit shall be issued except to a natural person and in no case to any business, firm, partnership or corporation."

Proposition M makes a subtle but significant change in that language. It says that "taxicab" permits must go to natural persons, but "specialized vehicle for hire" permits, meaning FLEET PERMITS and others, may be issued to "two or more persons".

According to Barron's Law Dictionary, "person" is defined as follows: "in law, an individual or incorporated group having certain legal rights and responsibilities." In contrast, a "natural person" is "a human being, as opposed to artificial or fictitious 'persons' such as corporations." Enough said?

Why should the public care about who gets the permits? Here's why:

Service is better and safer when an experienced cab driver/permit holder -- not an absentee owner or corporation in it simply for profit -- is personally responsible for the vehicle he or she drives.

From the driver's standpoint, Prop K has provided unparalleled opportunities for hundreds of working people -- in large part drawn from minority groups -- to gain a stake in the cab industry and earn a better livelihood for themselves and their families.

Preserve cab driver opportunity.

Say NO to corporate welfare.

Put service and safety first.

Vote NO on M!

United Taxicab Workers/CWA

The true source of the funds used for the printing of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are
 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Association, Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

Taxicab Permits

M

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

This Taxi Measure is Self-Serving

Everyone knows we need more cabs in San Francisco. Unfortunately, Prop M is just the latest round in the self-serving fight between cab drivers and cab companies.

Its purpose is to allow corporate ownership of certain kinds of cab permits. From the perspective of the general public, this does little or nothing to help the cab situation.

Vote no on Prop M.

www.spur.org

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is the SPUR Urban Issues Committee.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Michael Alexander 2. Peter Mezey 3. John Weeden.

The taxi system needs fixing, but Prop. M won't do it. It is a grab for profits by big taxi companies that will not improve service. No on M.

Beryl Magilavy

Candidate for Supervisor, District 6

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee to Elect Magilavy Supervisor.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are 1. Jacob Sigg 2. Esther Marks 3. Carolyn Caine.

Stand up to the big taxi companies and special interests!

Vote No on M!

Chris Daly

Candidate, District 6 Supervisor

Robert Haaland

Vice President, Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Chris Daly.

This measure will only increase the bottom line of taxi companies by giving them unearned medallions. They are in the car leasing business, not in service to the public. The Taxi Commission can improve service without this measure. **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M.**

Denise D'Anne

Supervisor Candidate, District 6

The true source of funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Denise D'Anne.

LABOR CONDEMNS PROPOSITION M

Cab companies have deprived cab drivers of workers' compensation and unemployment insurance, fought taxi gate (lease fee) control, and resisted even elemental improvements in job conditions, such as safety improvements, in this most dangerous occupation.

Drivers lack negotiated contracts, job benefits, job security, or any say in the terms and conditions of their employment.

Now, companies want to close the door even further by reducing or eliminating a driver's chances of obtaining a city-owned taxicab permit and gaining a stake in the taxi industry.

These permits now go only to drivers, who wait 10-15 years for them. Proposition M would allow them to be issued to companies.

How long will drivers have to wait for a permit if Proposition M passes? In many cases, forever.

Cab companies have been to the ballot six times before, attempting to get their hands on permits. This seventh try -- the most devious of the lot -- deserves the same fate as the rest.

Vote No on Proposition M, and send this greed-based measure into the growing scrap heap of failed cab company attempts to enrich themselves at their drivers' expense.

San Francisco Labor Council

Labor Neighbor

Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, Local 2

Service Employees International Union, Joint Council 2

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

M

Taxicab Permits

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

PROPOSITION M WON'T HELP NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE

As the publisher of neighborhood newspapers in the Richmond and Sunset Districts, I understand the problems of taxi service in outlying areas. But I also know that Proposition M is not the solution. Neighborhood taxis can be authorized under current law. But more to the point would be a centralized dispatch system which would give callers access to every cab in the city.

Here's what the press is saying about Proposition M:

"... it's no secret what the cab companies have in mind. Under the guise of improving service, the industry wants to seize control over the city's currently public taxi permits -- and to eliminate the requirement that drivers (as opposed to corporations) get the benefits of those permits."

S.F. Bay Guardian

"The initiative is . . . really an attempt to put taxi medallions in the hands of taxi companies, without accomplishing anything to significantly improve taxi service . . ."

"The initiative is sneaky . . ."

"If the taxi initiative is the most obscure, confusing, inconclusive measure on the November ballot -- and it is -- the initiative will almost certainly be backed by the slickest ad campaign of the election season."

Matt Smith, SF Weekly

Don't fall for it. **Vote NO.**

Paul Kozakiewicz

Publisher, Sunset Beacon and Richmond Review

The true source of the funds used for the printing fee of this argument is Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

The largest contributors to the true source recipient committee are: 1. Good Government Alliance 2. The S.F. Taxicab Permit Holders and Drivers Assn., Inc. 3. United Taxicab Workers/CWA.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION M

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION OF TAXICABS AND OTHER MOTOR VEHICLES FOR HIRE

An Ordinance amending Appendix 6 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (adopted June 6, 1978) providing regulations, policies and procedures relating to the issuance by the Police Taxi Commission of permits for taxicabs and other motor vehicles for hire in the City and County of San Francisco; regulating the times for operation under such permits, non-transferability of permits, ~~surrender and exchange of existing permits~~ provisions as to corporate permittees, financial and accounting records, and certain aspects of taxicab rates; ~~repealing various sections of Parts II and III of the San Francisco Municipal Code; and providing for severability.~~

Be It Ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

SECTION 1. The qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare it shall be the law of the City and County of San Francisco that:

(a) All taxicab permits and other vehicle for hire permits issued by the City and County of San Francisco are the property of the people of the City and County of San Francisco and shall not be sold, assigned or transferred; and

(b) The ~~Chief of Police Taxi Commission~~ of the City and County of San Francisco shall have the responsibility of establishing regulations to assure prompt, courteous and honest service to the riding public; and

(c) The taxicab business shall operate under the principles of free enterprise and that taxicab operators may charge less than the minimum rate of fare set by law, as set forth below.

(d) The ~~Taxi Police~~ Commission shall issue a sufficient number of permits to assure adequate taxicab service throughout the City and County of San Francisco.

~~(e) The Taxi Commission shall have the discretion to issue specialized vehicles for hire permits (ramp taxis) and to establish such standards and conditions as it deems to be in the best interests of providing service to disabled persons in San Francisco. Each such permit may be issued to two or more persons, i.e., ten persons may be issued five permits.~~

~~(f) The Taxi Commission shall have the discretion to determine whether the availability of~~

~~a sufficient number of permits during transportation emergencies, peak time demand periods, restricted neighborhood permits, airport-only permits, San Francisco-only permits and fleet permits would be in the interest of public convenience and necessity and, if so, to authorize the issuance of such permits. Each such permit may be issued to two or more persons, i.e., ten persons may be issued five permits.~~

SECTION 2. The Application for a Permit Permit Application.

(a) Any applicant(s) for a permit(s) to operate a taxicab(s) or other vehicle(s) for hire shall apply to the ~~Police Taxi Commission~~ for its declaration of public convenience and necessity on blanks to be furnished by the Secretary of the ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission, and within 15 days of the filing of such an application the Secretary of the ~~Taxi Police~~ Commission shall have a notice published in the official newspaper of the City and County of San Francisco. The notice shall state that an application has been filed for a license(s) ~~or permit~~ to operate a taxicab(s) ~~or~~ other motor vehicle(s) for hire business, the name of the applicant, the kind of equipment, and the number of taxicabs or other vehicles ~~for hire which the applicant(s) desires to operate.~~ The notice shall be published for three ~~consecutive~~ ~~successive~~ days.

The applicant(s) shall pay to the City and County of San Francisco a sum to cover the costs of advertising and investigating and processing the application(s) for each permit(s), such sum to be determined periodically as appropriate by the ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission.

Protests against the issuing of ~~a any~~ permits may be filed with the ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission. The ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission shall consider all protests and in conducting its hearings shall have the right to call such witnesses as it desires. ~~In all such hearings, the burden of proof shall be upon the applicant to establish by clear and convincing evidence which shall satisfy the Police Commission, that public convenience and necessity require the operation of the vehicle or vehicles for which permit application has been made, and that such application in all other respects should be granted. In all such hearings, the Taxi Commission must be satisfied that public convenience and necessity require the operation of the vehicle(s) for which permit applications have been made, and that such applications in all other respects should be granted.~~

~~(b) No permit shall be issued unless the person applying for the permit shall declare under penalty of perjury his or her intention actively~~

~~and personally to engage as permittee driver under any permit issued to him or her for at least four hours during any 24 hour period on at least 75 percent of the business days during the calendar year. No more than one permit shall be issued to any one person.~~

~~(b) All permit applicants must declare under penalty of perjury their intention to actively and personally operate the motor vehicle for hire permit(s) for which application is made. At all times after issuance of said permit(s), the permittee(s) shall actively and personally operate the permit(s) for at least 800 hours in each consecutive 12 month period during which the permit(s) is/are held. Except as expressly provided herein, no more than one permit shall be issued to any one person.~~

~~(c) For two years from the effective date of this Ordinance, a preference in the issuance of any permit(s) shall be given to any person(s) who ~~have~~ driven a taxicab or operated taxicabs or other motor vehicles for hire in the City and County of San Francisco for at least one consecutive 12 month period during any of the three calendar years immediately prior to the filing of an application for issuance of such permit in the year immediately before the processing of the application for issuance of a permit. The applicants shall be considered qualified upon submittal of evidence that they had driven or operated a taxicab(s) as indicated for a total of 800 hours in the period noted above.~~

~~(d) No taxicab permit(s) shall be issued except to a natural person(s) and in no case to any business, firm, partnership or corporation.~~

~~(e) Subject to any other preference created in this Ordinance, all applications for a permit(s) to operate a taxicab(s) or other motor vehicle for hire shall be processed and considered in the order of their receipt by the ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission.~~

~~(f) No part of this Section 2 shall apply to any permit holder(s) who were issued permits prior to June 6, 1978, described in subparagraph (b) of Section 4 of this Ordinance. The provisions of this Section 2 shall apply to all permit holders who were issued permits subsequent to June 6, 1978.~~

SECTION 3. Facts to be Considered by ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission.

The ~~Police Taxi~~ Commission, in determining whether or not public convenience and necessity exist for the issuance of a permit(s), may

(Continued on next page)

LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION M (CONTINUED)

consider such facts as it deems pertinent, but must consider whether:

(a) The applicant(s) ~~is~~ are financially responsible and will maintain proper financial records.

(b) The public will not be adequately or properly served unless the application(s) ~~is~~ are granted.

(c) The applicant(s) ~~has~~ have complied with all provisions of the Municipal Code, including pertinent motor vehicle laws.

(d) The applicant(s) will be a full-time driver(s), within the meaning of Section 2(b) of this Ordinance, of the taxicab or other motor vehicle for hire.

SECTION 4. Continuous Operation.

(a) All permittees within the purview of Section 1075 of Chapter VIII, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Police Code) shall regularly and daily operate their taxicab or other motor vehicle for hire business during each day of the year to the extent reasonably necessary to meet the public demand for such taxicab or motor vehicle for hire service.

Upon abandonment of such business for a period of 10 consecutive days by a permittee or operator, the ~~Police~~ Taxi Commission shall, after five days' written notice to the permittee or operator, revoke the permit or permits of such permittee or operator; provided, however, that the Chief of Police, subject to the approval of the ~~Police~~ Taxi Commission and only after a thorough investigation, may on written application grant to the holder of any permit hereunder permission to suspend operation pursuant to such permit for a period not to exceed 90 calendar days in any one 12 month period in case of sickness, death, or other similar hardship.

No permit issued under this Ordinance shall be transferable or assignable, either expressly or by operation of law. All such permits and all rights granted under them may be rescinded and ordered revoked by the ~~Police~~ Taxi Commission for good cause.

~~(b) All persons, businesses, firms, partnerships, corporation or other entities who possess outstanding permits to operate a motor vehicle for hire on the effective date of this section must surrender and exchange any such permits for new permits within 60 days of the effective date of this section. The new permits shall be non-transferable and non-assignable either expressly or by operation of law. Any such surrender and exchange shall be without fee to the permit holder. From and after the sixty-first day after the effective date of this section, all permits not surrendered for new permits shall~~

~~be void and continuance of operation under any such void permits shall be punishable by a \$500 fine and 30 days incarceration in the county jail for each such void permit so used.~~

SECTION 5. Corporate Permittee.

(a) If any permittee is a corporation, any sale or other transfer of 10 percent or more ~~or~~ of the stock ownership or assets of the permittee, resulting from any transaction or series of transactions and computed on a cumulative basis, will be deemed to be a sale or transfer and the permit therefore shall be null and void; ~~unless approved by the Police Commission in conformity with the requirements of this Ordinance. Any increase in the percentage of ownership in a corporation by one or more original shareholders by means of a buy-out, re-purchase or otherwise, shall also count toward the 10 percent transfer of ownership as provided herein.~~

(b) Any corporation holding a permit hereunder shall maintain a stock register at the principal office of the corporation in San Francisco and the stock register shall be available to the ~~Police Department~~ Taxi Commission for inspection. Such corporation shall report to the ~~department~~ Taxi Commission, in writing, any of the following:

(i) Issuance or transfer of any shares of stock to any person where the issuance or transfer results in the person owning 10 percent or more of the corporate stock.

(ii) Change in any of the corporate officers which are required by Section 821 of the California Corporations Code.

(iii) Change of any members of its board of directors.

(iv) Any change in the total number of shares or stockholders outstanding.

(c) Any report required pursuant to Subparagraph (b) hereof shall be filed with the ~~Police Department~~ Taxi Commission within 10 days of the change, sale or transfer to be reported.

SECTION 6. Maintaining Financial and Accounting Records.

The Controller of the City and County of San Francisco shall have the responsibility of establishing regulations for the keeping and filing of financial statements and accounting books and records by every holder of a taxicab permit or other type of permit under this Ordinance. The purpose of such regulations is to provide infor-

mation to the Board of Supervisors for ordinances respecting maximum rates of fares or other charges, and to the ~~Police~~ Taxi Commission for the performance of its duties under the law. Failure of any permit holder to comply with the Controller's regulations may be cause for revocation of all rights granted to a permit holder to operate a taxicab or other vehicle for hire.

SECTION 7. Rates for Taxicabs.

Notwithstanding any provision of the San Francisco Municipal Code, any person, firm or corporation operating a taxicab or taxicabs may set a rate of fare lower than the maximum rate which may be set from time to time by appropriate ordinance; ~~provided, however, that any such lower rate shall be filed with the Board of Supervisors in writing prior to June 1st of any year, and, if approved by the Board, shall remain in effect until September 1st of the following year.~~

SECTION 8.

~~Sections 1076, 1077, 1079 and 1135(B) of Chapter VIII, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Police Code) are hereby repealed.~~

SECTION 9.

~~Sections 128.1, 128.2 and 128.3 of Part III, Article 2 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, are hereby repealed.~~

SECTION 40 g. Severability.

If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase in ~~the~~ this Ordinance or any part thereof, is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. The qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that they would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivision, paragraphs, sentence, clause or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.