PROPOSITION J

Shall taxicab permit holders be permitted to sell their permits, and shall the City make other changes to the laws which regulate taxicabs?  

YES  NO

Digest

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City issues a limited number of taxicab permits. Permits are issued to individuals only, not to companies. Taxicab permits are the property of the City, and may not be sold.

A permit holder is required to personally drive the taxicab for a specified number of hours per year. When a permit holder is not driving the taxicab, he or she may charge a “lease fee” to another person or company for the right to operate the taxicab. That person or company may in turn, charge drivers an “operating fee” for the right to drive the taxicab for a particular shift. The City regulates taxi fares but does not regulate lease fees or operating fees.

Applicants for taxicab permits do not need to have experience driving a taxicab.

The City has a paratransit program which provides lower-cost taxicab services to certain elderly and disabled persons.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is an ordinance that would allow a permit holder to transfer the permit to the qualified bidder offering the highest price. Taxicab permits would remain the property of the City. The City would approve all permit transfers. The City would receive $10,000, or 20% of the transfer price, whichever was greater, for each transfer. For two years following passage of Proposition J, permit holders could transfer their permits only if they had held them for ten years or more.

The City would set maximum lease fees and operating fees based on average fees in effect on May 1, 1996. The City would determine these averages by conducting a survey. The City would then adjust these fees, and taxi fares, every two years based on changes in the cost of living.

Other provisions of Proposition J include:

• Permit holders who work as managers for taxicab companies would no longer be required to drive the taxicab for the specified number of hours per year.

• Before receiving a permit, applicants would be required to have at least five years experience driving taxicabs in San Francisco.

• The City would issue a limited number of additional permits to taxicab companies that participate in the paratransit program. Taxicabs using these permits could only be operated on weekdays, but would not be restricted to paratransit activity.

• Fines for illegal operation of a taxicab would be increased.

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

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

Should the proposed measure be approved, in my opinion, the cost effect of the ordinance would be minimal. Some revenues will result from fees paid to the City for the transfer of existing taxicab licenses, the amount of which depends upon the number of licenses transferred. Additional costs to survey, regulate and adjust the number of taxi permits, taxi fares and lease and operating (gate) fees and monitor taxi operations may be incurred but these should be minimal.

How “J” Got on the Ballot

On July 26, 1996 the Department of Elections received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Alioto, Brown, Hsieh, Katz, Kaufman, and Teng. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
Taxicabs

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J: Comprehensive, Progressive Reform of San Francisco’s Taxi Industry

San Franciscans depend on a taxi system that works well for everyone.

San Francisco’s taxi industry faces many challenges: Neighborhoods not close to downtown need better taxi service, during busy times there aren’t enough cabs, and there is a need for increased paratransit service.

Today, many taxi drivers don’t have access to health and disability insurance. Drivers who want to own their own operating permit must wait twenty years to get one. If Proposition J passes everyone will benefit: passengers, cab companies, cab drivers and our City. Proposition J will tackle those problems head on. It is a comprehensive, progressive reform measure. Proposition J will:

• create new taxi operating permits to put more cabs on the street during peak times;
• provide incentives for taxi companies to participate in the City’s paratransit program serving seniors and person with disabilities;
• require cab companies to offer drivers access to health and disability insurance;

• allow drivers who currently hold operating permits to sell them to qualified drivers (not taxi cab companies);
• require the Police Commission to monitor the transfer of operating permits and guard against profiteering;
• increase penalties against unlicensed limos and cabs that steal business away from legitimate cab drivers.

If you can’t get a cab when you need one, if you are tired of waiting endlessly for a cab, if you believe drivers should have a fair chance at earning a decent wage, if you believe in better paratransit service for seniors and the disabled, and if you believe that all drivers should have access to health insurance — Vote YES on Proposition J.

Supervisor Amos Brown
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Leslie Katz
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Mabel Teng

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you want to hire wordsmiths to dissemble and deceive voters, the sponsors and slick campaign managers of Proposition J are your best bet. Reading their argument for Proposition J is like Alice in Wonderland!

It’s a joke to believe the misrepresentation that the police commission will “monitor” the sale of taxicab permits and “guard against profiteering.” Profiteering is the underpinning of Proposition J. It’s the reason sponsors and their acquisitive campaign managers inveighed six weak supervisors to place it on the ballot, a devious effort to overturn the 1978 voter-adopted reform of a corrupt taxicab permit system which allowed taxicab companies to use city permits for personal financial gain. A bigger joke?: the assertion that only drivers with “five years experience” will purchase permits. Average drivers cannot — and should not — be forced to pay $100,000 – $200,000 for government permits! Proposition J is simple; the taxicab moguls want to regress to a system which allowed them to profiteer at our expense. It’d be like selling privately for profit a residential parking permit. If they want the Police Department to issue additional permits, why not join those of us who have advocated more permits for years? The Mayor, for example, favors issuance of more taxicab permits. That’s not the “gain”, however, represented by Proposition J. Proposition J is yet another taxicab company “ripoff” which voters have thwarted five times since we reformed the system in 1978. Let’s not be fooled; vote NO on J.

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.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is yet another of the efforts of the taxicab moguls to return to the pre-1978 system of using governmental permits as if that was private property. Proposition J would effectually allow taxicab companies to sell city taxicab permits *privately*, rather than return them to the Police Department for re-issuance at a nominal administrative cost to genuine taxicab drivers, some of whom have been waiting 17 years to obtain a permit to operate a taxicab in San Francisco.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J

In June 1978, San Francisco voters approved Proposition K, which ended the power of taxicab companies to sell Police Department-issued taxicab permits for tens of thousands of dollars. (Today, in New York City for example, such permits are regularly sold for sums in excess of $100,000, and it's almost impossible for the average driver to enter the taxicab industry. Four times thereafter measures to repeal Proposition K were rejected by voters, and by ever-increasing margins. Taxicab companies even tried to invalidate Proposition K in the courts and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on attorneys for such futile purpose. The last such time a taxicab measure was on the ballot, taxicab companies and confederates reportedly spent $450,000 to defeat a taxicab driver-inspired initiative measure. Their ability to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on ballot measures demonstrates their profits. Repealing the present system which forbids treatment of public permits as private assets, would generate permit prices of $100,000 and more. Real cab drivers would be excluded.

Vote "NO" on Proposition J and save the integrity of a Police Department permitting system which grants opportunity to cab drivers, not company executives, much less non-taxicab drivers like lawyers, doctors and businessmen.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Chairman

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Currently, there are two ways that taxi drivers are allowed to drive in San Francisco: Drivers can obtain an operating permit — a license to drive a cab — free from the City. Drivers who want a City operating permit now wait up to 20 years to get one. Or, a driver can "rent", for a fee, a permit from a current permit holder or taxi company. Drivers who "rent" make much less than those who have a City permit.

Proposition J will provide an additional way for a driver to receive a City permit. It will allow current permit holders to transfer their permits to working cab drivers. Proposition J *prohibits permit transfers to companies.* Further, it directs the Police Commission to oversee this system and to "protect against profiteering." This new system increases access to the taxi industry for working drivers. Cab drivers win with Proposition J.

Proposition J’s other reforms include:
1) more cabs on the street at peak times by issuing new “restricted permits”;
2) increased participation in the City’s paratransit program to provide more service to seniors and disabled persons; and
3) a requirement that taxicab companies offer drivers access to health and disability insurance.

Vote Yes on Proposition J — for progressive, comprehensive reform to put more taxis on our streets, better serve San Francisco’s taxi customers, help stabilize the taxi industry, and help cab drivers secure their futures.

Supervisor Amos Brown
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Leslie Katz
Supervisor Barbara Kaufman
Supervisor Mabel Teng
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco Supervisors Support Proposition J
Proposition J provides comprehensive, progressive reform that is critical to the future of the City's taxi industry. It is a fair measure, crafted after months of discussion and negotiation from the public, the industry — management and labor, and elected officials.
Prop J will:
• Put more cabs on the street during regular business hours — the times when taxi cabs are needed most.
• Increase the number of paratransit taxi cabs for seniors and disabled citizens.
• Provide for drivers access to group health and disability insurance.
• Limit fare charged to passengers by tying them to the rate of inflation.
• Provide opportunities for drivers to become permit owners by allowing the transfer of permits from current owners to qualified drivers.
• Place the Police Commission in charge of overseeing the transfer of operating permits.
• Generate revenue for the City without a tax increase.
Proposition J will bring long overdue reform to this important local industry.

Please join Supervisors Amos Brown, Tom Hsieh, Leslie Katz, Barbara Kaufman and Mable Teng in supporting this worthwhile measure.

Supervisor Michael Yaki
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

Gate Control Benefits Drivers and Customers
Proposition J will finally put an end to the skyrocketing costs a driver must pay to rent a cab. In much the same way that rent control protects renters, gate control protects taxi drivers.
In addition, any increases in driver rental fees are tied to 50 percent of the rate of inflation. This results in a fair, not arbitrary, rate system for the drivers.
As progressives who have fought for San Francisco's tenants and renters, we urge you to give taxi cab drivers and customers the same protections renters get by voting YES on Proposition J.

Affordable Housing Alliance
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

No Profitting — Vote Yes on Proposition J!
Proposition J will allow for the limited transferability of taxi permits, for a fee, to qualified drivers (five year minimum driving experience). It cleans up the current waiting list by adding specific eligibility requirements. It is explicitly written to give the Police Commission authority to conduct and approve the transfer of the permits — publicly, at open Commission hearings.
The City will assess a transfer fee of $10,000 or 20% of the sale price of any permit. This fee will go into the City's general fund, adding revenue for important programs. All transfers will be done in the spirit of fairness and openness, under the watchful eye of the Police Commission. Prop J directs the Police Commission to protect against profit taking.
Proposition J is truly a progressive move in the right direction. Vote Yes on J.

Frank M. Jordan
Juanita Owen, Former Police Commissioner
Wayne Friday, Former Police Commissioner
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

Finally! Health Benefits for Cab Drivers
Proposition J, the progressive, comprehensive, taxi reform measure, will do what should have been done a long time ago — require cab companies to offer to drivers access to group health and disability benefits. Drivers who can rely on health and disability insurance will feel more secure about their jobs — and do a better job serving the public. Prop J also includes an important provision that protects drivers from losing their eligibility for a permit should they temporarily not be able to drive (e.g. because of pregnancy, HIV, disability, etc.).
Drivers will benefit from a more stable taxi industry. And, under Prop J, qualified drivers will receive an opportunity to invest in the industry and in their own future by purchasing their own permits.
Proposition J gives taxi drivers a level playing field. That means better taxi service for all San Franciscans.

Health Benefits — Employee Ownership — Better Service
— A Stable Work Environment.
Join us in voting YES on Proposition J.

Naomi Gray, Former Health Commissioner
Margaret Kaufman, Former Health Commissioner
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J
Taxi Reform that All San Franciscans Can Support
Since 1978, voters have considered and rejected various taxi proposals that have been on the ballot. In addition to covering all aspects of this industry, Proposition J finally addresses a fundamental issue: Transferability of permits by those who hold them privately to qualified drivers who want to become permit owners. Prop J will restrict the permit waiting list in a fair way. Prop J requires five years of local driving experience — that empowers drivers who are committed to quality service and know the City well.

The Police Commission will oversee the transfer and sale of permits to ensure fairness and prevent profiteering. A fee imposed on the transfer of each permit will be the greater of $10,000 or 20% of the purchase price — making this an important revenue generator for the City’s general fund at a time when San Francisco could use additional resources.

The ability to transfer permits to qualified drivers and more revenue for the City all add up to one conclusion — Vote YES on Proposition J!

Carole Migden, Assemblywoman
Carlota del Portillo, School Board Member
Dr. Leland Y. Yee
Jason Wong

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for National Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Hasan Mashal
Vladimir Kryu
Vladimir Polyakov
Aleksander Brakrusso
Sameh Alkalaila
Manoch Amireh Sani
Yong K. Park
Jamal Hasary
Balzit Sonel
Y. Goldenberg

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was The Committee for Better Taxi Service.

SAY YES TO PROP J
FOR MORE PARATRANSPORT SERVICE
San Francisco's senior and disabled communities rely on taxi cab paratransit service as a dependable transportation option. Proposition J will increase paratransit service for those who need it.

Under Proposition J, taxi cab companies who participate in the paratransit program will receive additional restricted permits to operate taxi cabs during peak times. Therefore, more taxi cab companies will have an incentive to provide paratransit service.

And, as more companies begin offering paratransit service, outlying neighborhoods will get better cab service. Customers won’t have to wait for taxi cabs that never show up.

The senior and disabled communities must have real transportation options. Without them, getting around the City can be difficult, if not impossible.

Proposition J will address this problem by providing more paratransit cabs to serve the senior and disabled communities.

Vote yes on Prop J. It’s important to our community.

August J. Longo
The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Democratic Club for Persons with Disabilities and Seniors
Jose Caedo, Member, Mayor’s Disability Council
Laurie Graham, Yellow Ramp Taxis Limited Partners & member, Executive Committee, Paratransit Coordinating Council
Jim West, Emergency Planner
Nancy Levin, Former President, Commissioner, SF public Utilities Commission
Michael Kwok, ViceChair, Paratransit Council

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

More taxis, better transportation, more jobs, better economy, more taxes, better learning.

It’s that simple.

Adam Sparks
Candidate for San Francisco Board of Education
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Friends of Adam Sparks for School Board.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Progressive Taxi Reform — Fairness for Drivers — Better Service for Residents

Taxi measures have been on the ballot for as long as we can remember. But none will reform the industry as comprehensively and progressively as Proposition J.

We support Prop J because it will:
• Create “peak use” permits that put more cabs on the street when you need them — during regular business hours.
• Add more paratransit permits to assist seniors and the disabled.
• Provide job stability and access to group health and disability benefits for taxi drivers.
• Restrict eligibility of the waiting list to qualified local drivers with a minimum of five years of taxi driving experience.
• Allow for qualified drivers to purchase operating permits from a current permit holder.

Join progressive San Franciscans from every community and neighborhood by voting Yes on Proposition J.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Tony Leone, RN
Kevin Piedisciaci, Co-Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James A. Prevo
Carole S. Cullum, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Jim West
Jo Kuney
Cara A. Shean

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for Veterans Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Christopher Orji
Christine R. Lotz
Michael Tucker

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was The Committee for Better Taxi Service.

Proposition J Will Provide Better Service to the African American Community

Have you ever tried getting taxi service in Bayview/Hunters Point, Ingleside or Western Addition? Clearly the limited number of cabs on the street, and the high demand for them downtown, means taxi cab drivers will continue to ignore our neighborhoods.

Prop J will change that. It will create a more diverse workforce, with experienced drivers committed to the taxi industry as a full-time profession. Prop J allows newly qualified drivers to get a permit immediately — not wait 20 years to obtain one from the City. It puts more taxi cabs on the street, including more taxi cabs for our seniors and disabled. That means better service for our neighborhoods and better service for our community.

Join African American leaders in saying YES to progressive taxi reform — YES on Proposition J.

Assessor Doris Ward
Sabrina Saunders, Member, Democratic County Central Committee
James H. Mayo II, Director of the College Fund, UNCF
Gwendolyn Westbrook, President, Black Leadership Forum

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

Proposition J Will Help Fund City Services Without Raising Your Taxes

Proposition J will generate new revenue for the City’s general fund. Under Proposition J, each time a taxi operating permit is transferred, the City will collect a minimum of $10,000 in fees. Over the next several years, hundreds of these operating permits will be transferred. That means millions of dollars for the City’s general fund.

Vote Yes on J. It means more revenue for City services!

Lawrence Wong, President, SF Community College Board
David Janison, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Jim Herlihy, Lakeside Property Owners Association
Glenn E. Ortiz-Schuldt, President, S.F. Medic One Foundation
Diane Filippi

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Taxi Cab Industry Support Proposition J

The taxi cab industry operates under guidelines that have not changed in nearly 20 years. Proposition J provides the reform necessary to address the current needs of drivers and customers.

A consensus document, crafted with input from the public, taxi cab drivers, and the taxi cab industry, Proposition J will help stabilize an industry that must provide customers with better service and stabilize working conditions for the whole industry.

Under Proposition J:
1. More cabs will be on the streets during busy times.
2. Drivers, for the first time, will have access to group health and disability insurance.
3. Qualified drivers will have the opportunity to purchase their own operating permits, rather than waiting 20 years to get one from the City. That means a more committed and more diverse taxi cab industry.
4. Any increases in driver rental fees will be tied to 50% of the rate of inflation.
5. Fare increases will be limited by and tied to the rate of inflation. Please join us in supporting these important reforms that will improve and stabilize an industry that is important to San Francisco. Join us in supporting Proposition J.

James O’Connor
President of National Cab Co.

Nate Dwiri, President and General Manager, Yellow Cab Cooperative, Inc.

James E. Steele
Executive Vice-President Yellow Cab

Robert Jacobs
Executive Director, San Francisco Taxi Association

Mary Warner, President-Manager, Luxor Cab

Dan Hinds, General Manager of DeSoto Cab

As an economist, I was asked to prepare a study on the business implications of Proposition J. After studying the far-reaching reforms addressed in Proposition J, it is my opinion that Proposition J will provide tremendous economic benefits for taxi cab drivers, permit holders and San Francisco, while reforming a system for the control and distribution of taxi cab permits that is archaic, inefficient and unfair.

Prop J will put more cabs on the streets. Companies which participate in paratransit for seniors and the disabled will receive special restricted permits to put more cabs on the street during peak times. The number of new permits equals 10% of each company fleet of cabs or 60 more permits. At least 60 new cabs will serve San Francisco residents when they need them most. This provision demonstrates how the proper market incentives can work to serve the public good.

Taxicab drivers will have the opportunity to invest in themselves and control their own economic future by purchasing an operating permit in a monitored, fair market process. Currently, drivers must wait up to 20 years for a permit from the City or continue to rent a taxi from a permit holder. These drivers are essentially modern day serfs, with no long-term stake in or commitment to the taxi industry. Under Proposition J, drivers can buy their own permit immediately, invest in themselves and realize a return on that investment.

If Prop J passes, the City will collect a fee for the transfer of a permit. The fee will be a minimum of $10,000 or 20% of the sale price. Based on a market value calculation and a reasonable expectation of approximately 30 permits transferring a year, the additional revenue to the City is estimated at between $600,000 and $900,000.

Patrick F. Mason, Ph.D., Consulting Economist

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for Yellow Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Mohamed Aslam
Mohamed Sovahir
Lawrence Wong
Tommy Lam
Roggilo Lusterios
Jaspal Singh
John Khooly
Patrick Wong
Patrick T. Callahan
James M. Cortesos
Richard M. Gross
James Gray
Tom S. Kellouropulos
Jim Erwin
Thomas J. Im
Rait Denictas
Dennis John Evans
William O'Brien
Gerald Gannon
Kurt Harrison
Khalid James
James F. Kennedy
James A. Maddox
Jon M. Garin
Constantino D. Peralta
Harold L. Jones
Woldii Kelati
Hershi Karp
Edward J. Pembidge
Maria Bove
Detlef Byner

Michael Lee
Francisco Hernandez
Peter Greenberg
Peter Crowley
Jono C. Lucovich
Douglas W. Barney
Wilson Broussard
Robert Walker
Roland Halli
Arthur Lembke
Tajinder Pal Singh
Laurie Graham
Stephen Reimers
Terrence Edenborg
Salvador Tirado
Peter Karstvedt
Tommy Lam
John Martin
Jack Majewski
Charles Morton
Doug Hamilton
Emmanuel Mouskeantakic
Jaime Pinto
Ubaid Khan Arid
John DiCicco
Lee Marciales
John Tsakaniks
George Fenoureyaki
Neil Jensen
Richard Arena
Simon Prenovitz

Jack Moreno
Roberto Sanz
Chung Ming Chiu
Michael Seasley
Butch Moran
Jaime Arguelles
John Gallardo
Enrique Vargas
Ronald Zammataro
Steven Keys
Robert Harris
Andre Campos
Olamo Doukado
John Diesso
Onur Erbug
Henry Mar
Francisco Mendes
Frank deMesa
Joe Boyles
Dai Nguyen
Asif Nawaz Ahmad
Mark Zeltser
Richard Nguyen
Dong Tran
Jeff Hong
Mahinder Singh
Khaliil Ibrahim
Larry Alhadef
Amer Mohammad Choudry
Abud Saleem
Chelly Ostromogilsky

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Committee for Better Taxi Service.
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San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for Yellow Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Roger S. Miozza
Sein H. Sav
Richard C. Wallace
Zahid Choudry
Boris Slepniov
Abayomi Shitty
Denise Alonzo
Florence Baltazar
Mohr Zaheem
Raffael Tishkorsky

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was
The Committee for Better Taxi Service.

----------
San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for Luxor Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Mary Warner
Karim Mary Adams
John Kelly
Rene Delenge
Alex Poulsberry
Thomas Mehrten
Dilbagh Toor
John Ezersky
Job Testamaram
Marc Lewis
Ghanem Elmashni
David Wagner
Thomas Jackson
Rudy Montequaro
Kim Olson
Mohamed Bachar
Luis Curiel
Frank Charani
Robert Terrakawa
Zhala Wisensu

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was
The Committee for Better Taxi Service.

----------

San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, The undersigned, are drivers for Yellow Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Douglas Homme
Robert Kowollik
Manohar Bawa
Bob Yates
Art Salerno
Miguel Del Pomar
Luong V. Tran
R. Cezar
Richard A. Roman
Patrick Tibbats
Nicholas N. Olson
David Gaze
Douglas Moss
Natalino Silva
Boris Rainer
George Wade
Menezes Estevam
Luis R. Muri
Jose Luis Cuevas
Gus Hensle
Rosita Salam
Rachid Romdane
Joseph Habtemarian
James Nixon
Nick Nichols
Ralph D. Hoffschildt

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was
The Committee for Better Taxi Service.

----------

The Golden Gate Restaurant Association SUPPORTS Proposition J
The restaurant industry relies on taxicab service. San Francisco needs more cabs on the street during peak hours so they can better serve our restaurant patrons. San Franciscans and tourists alike will benefit from improved cab service.

Vote YES on Prop J

Gianni Fassio, President
Paul Lazzareschi, Director
Kathleen Harrington, PAC Chair
Helen Hobbs, Public Affairs Chair

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The Hospitality and Visitor Industry:
We Need More Cabs for Better Service.

Visitors contribute millions of dollars to the City’s economy each year. The tourism and hospitality industry relies on a strong taxi cab system so our visitors can discover our City easily and safely. Access to the City’s great neighborhoods, stores, restaurants, and points of interests is critical for San Francisco to maintain its position as an important visitor and convention destination.

Proposition J supports the tourism and hospitality industry in several ways. Most importantly Prop J will put more taxi cabs on the street. In addition, it will help stabilize the taxi cab industry by encouraging more people to make driving a career, not just a transitional job. The reforms under Proposition J will attract more experienced, long-term drivers, increase the number of newer cabs and put more cabs on the street.

Vote Yes on J — For More Cabs and Better Service

Robert J. Begley
Executive Director
Hotel Council Of San Francisco

Robert Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Hotel Association

David Jamison
Member, Board of Directors
Downtown Association

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Committee for Better Taxi Service.

San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!

We, the undersigned, are drivers for United Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Grigory Lubarsky
Dimity Tvenstyr
Rakes Selger
Sueldee Singh
Leonid Shartikov
Son Nujan

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Committee for Better Taxi Service.

FAREPLAY FOR TAXI DRIVERS

A small group of taxi drivers opposes Proposition J apparently in the misguided belief that experienced, qualified drivers should not have an opportunity to own their own operating permits — and secure their financial future.

Why else would these opponents to Proposition J prefer that a qualified driver wait for 20 years to obtain a permit from the City when one finally becomes available, rather than buy one today? During that 20-year wait, a qualified driver must continue to pay “rent” — in the form of a “gate fee” — to a cab company for the privilege of using its permit to drive a cab. This rent comes right out of a driver’s pocket, reducing his or her income.

And, when that driver finally gets a permit after waiting 20 years, he or she may be too old to drive a cab. How will that benefit cab drivers?

Under Proposition J, a qualified driver can, in effect, own “a piece of the rock” by purchasing a permit today and keep a larger portion of fare income for himself or herself, rather than paying it to a cab company.

Why would someone pay rent for an apartment if he or she has an opportunity to buy a home? Similarly, why would a qualified driver want to continue to pay “rent” for a permit when he or she could buy one?

Give qualified drivers a chance to achieve the American dream by controlling their own financial destinies. Give them a chance to buy permits and keep more fare income for themselves. Give them a reason to commit to the taxi industry as a long-term profession to better serve all residents of San Francisco.

Vote Yes on Proposition J.

Jim Bolig
Medallion Holder #766

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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San Francisco Taxi Drivers Support Proposition J!
We, the undersigned, are drivers for DeSoto Cab Company and we support Proposition J!

Dmitry Astrakhantsev
Craig Henry
Ed Kim
Grant Fisher
Adam Ander
Jack Hoey
Abdul Maksoud
Eric Rankin
Hiem Buck Ngo
Richard A. Byers
Ronald S. Moise
Dennis M. Wong
Oleg Kostyukovskiy
Derek Epps
Fissena Gabrenichale
Mehrdad Ghassaminejad
Wing N. Tse
Sai M. Lee
Ak Cyril
Liparin Louie
David Q. Lau
Amr Mahmoud
Ed Burke
Alfred P. Stone
Edward J. Scoble
Scott G. Warren
Rick Johansen
Dan Hinos
Jim Bolig
James Panther
James E. Canales
Paul B. Mitchell
Sidney J. Martin
William Hancock
Richard Correll
Edwin Santiago
Bhupendra Patel
Kathleen Hughes
Yared Asnare
Balbir Singh
Ricardo Manansala
Alex J.
Doyle Lynsky
Alex Cherkas
Bob Giard
Bert Espinoza
Ping Chiu
James Rockquemore
Dwight Browning
Thomas L. Payne
Anwari Saleem
Steven Leonovicz
Joseph Tesfiset
Frank Wong
Renate Wymarkiewicz
Advane Atshan
Salim Maroun
Janet G. Acquiere
Rhyeka Stewart
S. Shulman
S. Lol
Mohammed S. Sherwani
Ly Sanh

Proposition J is Good News for San Francisco's Neighborhoods
Proposition J will put more cabs on the streets and in our neighborhoods — when and where we need them the most. It creates new peak use permits — permits for additional cabs to operate during regular business hours. Proposition J also creates an incentive for cab companies to provide more paratransit service, offering greater transit options for seniors and the disabled — mostly neighborhood residents who can't always get a cab when they need one. These reforms are good news for our neighborhoods.

More cabs means better service for our neighborhoods — That's why we urge you to vote Yes on Proposition J.

Lee Ann Prifti, President
Diamond Heights Community Association
Jon Braslaw
Maureen T. Richardson
Moira Bross
Todd High

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

San Francisco Democrats Support
Prop J — For Real Taxi Reform!

Democrats support progressive, comprehensive reform of the taxi industry. For drivers that will provide:
• Access for drivers to health and disability insurance.
• Better service to outer and neglected neighborhoods.
• Control of the lease/gate fees charged to taxi cab drivers, and fares charged to passengers, by tying increases to the rate of inflation.
• Revenue for the City's general fund from fees on the sale of operating permits to qualified drivers.
• Put more cabs on the street during peak times.
• Clean up the waiting list of permit applicants for taxi cab permits by restricting eligibility to qualified drivers who have driven in San Francisco for five years.
• Direct the Police Commission to oversee the transfer process and prevent profiteering and unfair competition.

Democrats Say Yes to Taxi Reform — Yes on Prop J.

David Serrano Sewell, President, Latino Democratic Club
Thoma Osborne, President of RFK Democratic Club

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.
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Prop J Enhances Transit Options for all San Franciscans

Many people would prefer to take taxi cabs to work, rather than drive, if they could count on the reliability and availability of taxi service. Proposition J will make that option a reality by improving taxi service in several ways:

- It will provide "peak time" operating permits, putting more taxis on the street, when and where you need them.
- It will provide more paratransit cabs for seniors and the disabled.
- It will give the Police Commission greater authority to penalize illegal and unlicensed vans, limos and taxis, ensuring public safety and safer cabs.
- It will encourage experienced drivers to stay in the industry by allowing them to purchase their own operating permits rather than wait 20 years to get one from the City.
- And, as a bonus, Prop J will generate more revenue for the City by assessing a minimum $10,000 transaction fee for every transferred permit.

As individuals committed to expanding transit options for all San Franciscans, we believe that Proposition J will improve taxi service by reforming the taxi industry. Vote YES on J.

Dennis Herrera
Transportation Commissioner

Arlene Chen Wong
Former Member, Public Transportation Commission

Anthony Belway

Deanna Seaman

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.

Proposition J Is Good for San Francisco's Businesses

From time to time, all businesses must change and adapt in order to secure a healthy future. The San Francisco taxi industry is no exception. To meet future challenges, taxi cab owners and drivers, working together with members of the public and City leaders, have crafted several common-sense reforms that will allow the taxi industry to remain a healthy, stable and vibrant part of our City's economy.

- Prop J will put more cabs on the street during the busiest times.
- Prop J will restrict future cab fare increases.
- Prop J will provide drivers much needed access to group health and disability benefits.
- Prop J will create an incentive to expand paratransit programs for our disabled and senior citizens.
- Prop J will give qualified, experienced drivers a greater opportunity to buy, rather than rent, their own operating permits. (They can, in effect, own their own business and control their own destiny.)

Prop J is good for our cab industry and our City. Please join us in supporting Prop J.

Angelo Quaranta
Owner, Allegro Restaurant

Clifford Waldeck
Owner, Waldeck's Office Supplies

Dan Dillon

Gino Fiorucci

Tim Johnson

Mark Hill

Phill Kitt.

Lou Castro

Jack Torre

The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was Comm. for Better Taxi Service.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is patently unfair. It should be soundly rejected by the voters of San Francisco.

Proposition J would allow current taxicab permit holders to take a public permit — a permit granted in the public interest by the City to that holder at minimal cost — and turn it into a speculative commodity to be sold to the highest bidder for their own enormous profit. Estimates range from $100,000 to $200,000.

NO new opportunities would be created for our hard-working drivers; but a few people will get a lot of money.

WE urge you to join us in rejecting this particularly pernicious special interest ploy. VOTE NO ON J.

Supervisor Sue Bierman
Supervisor Tom Ammiano

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

Drivers who buy exorbitantly-priced taxicab permits will overwork themselves to pay off enormous debts. This will constitute a safety hazard to both driver and public.

Beverly Graffis
Teacher, Taxi Driver Training Class
S.F. City College

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

Dear Voters:

Can you believe it? Cab companies are up to no good again.

Under current San Francisco taxicab law, taxi permits (medallions) can only be issued to applicants on a waiting list. Applicants receiving permits today have been waiting for 14 years.

Proposition J bypasses the waiting list by issuing taxicab permits directly to big cab companies. After having waited 14 years, permit applicants will get nothing. Big cab companies hope to get these permits by misleading the public.

In the interest of honor, justice, and the American way, I ask you to please vote no on Proposition J.

James Lewis
Former Chair, United Taxicab Workers

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

Get a taxi permit from the city for free, then sell it for $200,000? RIDICULOUS! As cab drivers who will wind up paying for this absurd giveaway, we ask you to vote NO on J.

Drivers for
Veterans Cab
Robert Migdal
Kenneth Whipple
John Law
William Platsant
Charles Summons,
Paul Lobell
Roy Glass
Francis Fox
Jene Rose
Herbert Grant
Richard Graham
Thomas Ferris
John Warren
Michael Parcell
Quang Dinh
John Thompson
Salal Tawashe
John Nickulas
Richard Finn
Jack Johnstone
Tom Hollifield
Ernesto Diala
Mather Harb
James Ingram
Walter J. Moreau
J. Ford
J. Gennerich
D. Grogg
K.P. Ly
E. Bustia
Lawrence Orenstein
Eugene Craven
Michael Gibbons
John W. Blackett
Jerry Nuvolone

Drivers for
City Cab
Joseph David
Frankel
Tony DeSimonia
Chris Sanderson
Gordon
Hernandez
Lester Harris
Wondewossen
Mekbib
Gatovich
Yadeta
William H.
Kilminster
Doroteo Alfaro
Tokunba Solarin
David Barlow
Peter Samuels
Varinder Singh
George Saedawi
Izaak Housepain
Bob Katsanes
Robert Wickey
Randy Lyle
Victor Jose Villar
Frank Yury
David Haase
Raymond
Rodriguez
Drivers for Ace
Cab
Arman Mehrani
Assa Singh
Multani
Osama Haddad
Drivers for
Bay Cab
Palminder Singh
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Get a taxi permit from the city for free, then sell it for $200,000? RIDICULOUS! As cab drivers who will wind up paying for this absurd giveaway, we ask you to vote NO on J.

Drivers for Yellow Cab
James Lewis
Mark Gruberg
Richard Fletcher
Barry Rosen
John Derry
Wasti Olohlo
Ferni Ohdau
Arif Zahir
Arthur H. Armstrong
Rafiq Jan
Tekle Mekieh
Pardip Saini
Frank J. Alonso
Sylvester Primes
Robert Davis
Willis Brossi
Edw. Millett
Christopher Clark
Roberto Pinto
Ivone Pinto
Jose Medrano
Tayyigir Orivat
Robert Allen
Fernando DeOliveira
Stanley B. Mauble
Muhammad Shahid
Clarindo Gomez
Donald Dillon
Frank Thomas
Stoudane Barkouki
Joshua Wylie
Mohammed Kashifmian
William Dutton
James Larson
Devin Walker
Maurice Harold
Eric Spillman
Richard Waltz-Smith
John Haggard
Seraphin Capili
B. Bagwannt Singh
Carl Macmuro
Marcell Ribeiro
Albert Pranba
James Bartlett
Arthur Tse
Antonio DaSilva
Michael Callahan
Ron Collins
Syed Naqul
Shahbeez Butt
Walter Brady
Ted Casselberry
Chess Sexton
Dan McGiffin
Akinmuitre Adebayo
Lloyd DuPuis
Jeffrey S. Solnick
Gerry Rowland
Ellsworth Gates

Anthony Presutto
Tim A. Pori
Legesse Seitu
Harsinder Klar
Edmund Zimmerman
Abdelmajid M. Hamid
Herbert V. Hesse
John Malloy
Uday Shetty
Jean M. Normand
Alexandre DePizzelowski
Alan Landy
Ronnie Eid
Gregg Castellucci
Philip Richards
Singh Gurbax
Cahrel Keally
Gurpal Sandhu
Paula A. Bloodsaw
Myles Kilroy
Chalres Souza
Ayoade Ismael
Ernie D. deLeon
Zahid Hassan
Hagos Gaim
Gislwinder Monoit
Kathleen Carroll
George Gilbert
Hadi-Khali
Barbara Arms
Jacques Berchten

Mahbub Ahmed
Estevam Roberto Menezes
Mike Lorenzen
Michael Lima
Akilulu Zewde
Jeff Nelson
Michael Mindlin
Robert Oregana
Bryan Foster
Brooks Dyer
John Panages
Constantine D. Peralta
James R. Newsome
Jeff Grove
Gregory Murray
Tony Kwong
Karim Abdulrahman
Imran Rehman
James Stringer
Dennis Higgins
Augusto Molero
Aaron Small
James Russell
Larry Mott
Feriedoon Golshav
Wanderley DeSouza
Francisco Silva
Julian M. Horowitz
Patrick Quain
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is ill-conceived, unjust and financially unsound:
• Taxicab permit prices of $200,000 will result in a financial drain
  on the taxicab industry which will drive down the quality of
  service and the earnings of drivers.
• A new 20% sales tax on the transfer of taxicab permits, payable
  by the cab driver purchasing the permit, is confiscatory and
  unfair, and sets a bad precedent for taxing startup businesses.

Prop J is a step backwards and would close the door of opportunity
  to minorities, women and other drivers trying to break into the
  system.

Vote NO on J.

Manuel Rosales, Member, Redevelopment Commission
Candidate for Supervisor
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was
Committee Against Permit Profiteering.

Prop J is all about MONEY. Who gets it? Taxi permit holders get
$200,000 each! Who pays it? Cab drivers and their passengers! How
do permit holders justify this windfall? They don’t. They claim Prop
J is all about better service and opportunity for cab drivers. It isn’t.
It’s about selling city-owned permits for huge profits.

Prop J pulls the rug out from under long-term cab drivers who
have played by the rules. It totally reverses city policy and puts the
taxi industry under the control of shady financiers instead of
working cab drivers. No on J!

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

Proposition J would permanently restrict elderly and disabled
users of subsidized paratransit scrip to certain cab companies which
choose to accept the scrip.

When federal welfare funds are cut next year, all San Franciscans
will have to help support social services. Participation in the
paratransit program should be required of ALL taxicabs as a
condition of their licenses.

Vote NO on J — the scheme that locks out reform.

Edward G. Evans, Chair, Senior and Disabled Concerns
Committee, North of Market Planning Coalition
(Affiliation for identification purposes only)

Labor condemns Proposition J, a scandalous get-rich-quick
scheme put forward by cab companies and the taxicab permit
holders who control them.

Cab companies have long treated their drivers with contempt, but
this proposition takes the cake. It would force drivers to pay permit
holders for city-owned taxicab permits which now are issued for
free! The driver’s one way up in this dangerous, stressful and
low-paying job will be blocked by an obstacle insurmountable for
most: a permit purchase price in the neighborhood of $200,000.

Prop J’s other provisions are just window dressing for the permit
scam. Drivers will earn less in real terms under the fraudulent gate
control provisions of Prop J. The provision which is supposed to
make health and disability benefits available to drivers is so vague
and ambiguous as to be meaningless. (For that reason, it’s not even
mentioned in the objective description at the head of this section.)
Even if some cab companies do make coverage available, drivers will
have to pay for every cent of it — and the price will be prohibitive.

Cab companies have done everything in their power to deprive
drivers of employer-financed worker protections mandated by law:
workers’ compensation, unemployment and disability benefits.
Now they’re touting a poor substitute at the driver’s expense.

Labor urges you to vote NO! on Proposition J.

San Francisco Labor Council
United Taxicab Workers/CWA
Service Employees International Union, Joint Council #2
Communications Workers of America, Local 9410
Hotel and Restaurant Employees, Local 2
Union United Educators of San Francisco

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

In an industry increasingly populated by people of color, Prop J
is a shameful attempt by cab companies to disenfranchise those
very drivers it purports to help. Only the independently wealthy
driver will be able to afford a $200,000 permit.

Vote NO on Prop J.

Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
The true source of funds used for the publication fee of this argument was
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Get a taxi permit from the city for free, then sell it for $200,000? RIDICULOUS! As cab drivers who will wind up paying for this absurd giveaway, we ask you to vote NO on J.

Drivers for Luxor Cab
Caverly Whittemore
Robert Conrad
Charles Glenn
James McKeeon
Howard Meehan
Tom Stanghellini
Shane Kramer
Charles Hawkins
Kevin McNamee
Kamaljit Singh
Tim Taylor
Dan Guaracli
Robert Colburn
Christopher Oliver
David Kreutzer
Michael Ferguson
Roger Riley
Ed Bruin
Barry Malton
Maurice W. Burrel, Jr.
Richard Navarro
Michael Reid
Mark Bushnell
A. Gorelick
Drivers for National Cab
Mohammed Humed
Saad Azirihi

Anatoli Belkrene
C. Gomes
Richard Kachmar
Simon M. Borshnikoff
Hail Quamis
Shahid Malik
Mohammed Choudry
Abdul Saleem
Felix Rozenblum
Peter Baumgarten
Freydoun H. Tolonii
Drivers for Diamond Cab
Mikhail Oshmyansky
Kien T. Vo
Phuc Phong Tran
Driver for Orange Cab
Sorov Ertihk
Driver for Falcon Cab
Anil Kumar
Driver for Golden Gate
Mohammad Tajamal
Driver for Checker Cab
Igor Kopetsman
Drivers for Central Cab
Kenneth Liang
Steve Tran

Drivers for Delta Cab
Steve Korshin
Vitaliy Selivanov
Driver for Star Cab
Tran Quen
Driver for Prime Time Cab
Fanid A. Omar
Driver for Sunshine Cab
James Dwong
Drivers for Pacific Cab
Kaher Delsieh
Ted K. Edae
Delano Chang
Drivers for United Cab
Aleksandr Smuk
Ajinder Singh
Trung K. Giang
Long Nguyen
Dang C. Larlz
Mohamed Bhati
Drivers for Yellow Cab
Francisco Carneiro
Russell W. Williams
Drivers for Yene Cab
Mohammad Hammad

Driver for Black & White
Checker
Semen Tsissoz
Drivers for Bayshore Cab
Hamad Mohamed
Ilya Palkin
Driver for Metro Cab
Farouq Rasul
Drivers for DeSoto Cab
Roger Jensen
Cliff Lundberg
Felix Justice
Gary J. Shukman
Larry Anderson
Wing Moy
Jeffrey Greenberg
Tom Davidson
Wayne Rantainen
James Rockquemore
John Cruse
Stephen Chen
Yosef Wendimu
Murai
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Get a taxi permit from the city for free, then sell it for $200,000? RIDICULOUS! As cab drivers who will wind up paying for this absurd giveaway, we ask you to vote NO on J.

Drivers for Yellow Cab
Tracy Tedler
Francoise Spiegelman
Guss Foreman
Harold E. Duhan
Teke Girmay
Ben Usog
Gary Mason
James Donnelly
Rashid Radwan
Hugh McGuire
David Ferris
Harry Arnegen
Bill Daley
James Webster
Kevin McCormick
Woldu Kefati
John Gonzales
Jim Chitinski
Diana M. Lawrence
Joseph Habtemariam
Michael Ryan
David Fine
Leland W. Stephens
Mario Silva
Jose Leon
Larry Sager
Parsuram Swamy
Mike Moroney
Henry Nguyen
David Johnston
Emil Savazlan
Harjit Singh
Guilhelme Jawqueira
Sandro Arajto
G. Maciel
Earl F. Moore
Aaron King
Artis Parker, Jr.
Michael Rothstein
Jeremy Mathis
Brad Newsham
Fabio Xavier
Lam Liu
Harley Sorensen
John Glynn

Drivers for Luxor Cab
Omar Asid
Joseph Tracy
Gerald Smith
Colin Davies
Meli Dowdian
Tim Epstein
Randall Feliciano
John Campbell
Jim Sward
Marcello Silva
Ralph Craig
David Wagner
Sohel Rahman
Robert Hachmann
Adrian Zomot

Harold Zigler
Lorenz Caruso
Mizan Rahman
Dale Fuller
William Christensen
Anthony J. Fernandez
George Roth
Abid Taoufik
Frank Tognotti
Luis Curiel
Edward Burke
William D. Wise
Michael Kazanig
Ted Milikin
Ron Balliett
Patrick Helland
Lance Mack
George England
Son Thai Nguyen
Victor S. Deabes

Drivers for National Cab
SuVan Vo
Sabir Ahmed
Anatoli Belkine
Vladmir Polyakov
Abir Bhutta
Boris Zayatz
Tufaid Ahmad

Sovni Sikim
Gabriel Torde
Baldit Singh
Zafar Ibalal
Drivers for DeSoto Cab
Ghaffar Khan
Husni Zaro
Osama Awkad
Michael Williams
Gabrechmichele Fisseke
Salim Maroun
Drivers for Ace Cab
Salah ElSaida
Ahmad Alhoueveya
Sulaiman W. Seruge
Frank Kamile
Drivers for Metro Cab
Kim Rosenkrants
Majdi Kamel
Drivers for United Cab
Vo Ly
Jan Yuen
Nho Phaim
V. Morgulis
Drivers for Clao Cab
Papinder Singh
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR REGULATION OF TAXICAB OPERATIONS

An ordinance providing regulations, policies and procedures relating to the issuance of taxicab permits by the Police Commission; regulations for the establishment of rates of fare; limitations on lease, rental or hire agreements; provisions for limited transferability of permits; right to purchase health and disability coverage by taxicab drivers; providing for the issuance of regulations by the Chief of Police; respecting various provisions of Appendix F to the charter of the city and county and Part II, Chapter VIII, Article 16 of the San Francisco Municipal Code; and providing a severability clause.

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The people of the city and county find that:

(a) Better Service. It is in the public interest to promote better taxi service for all San Franciscans. More taxis are needed during peak use times. Further, an emphasis on paratransit (disabled and senior transit services) is at the heart of this effort to reform the current service structure.

(b) Security and Opportunity for Cab Drivers. It is in the public interest to enhance the security of and economic opportunities for drivers within the taxi industry by creating guidelines as to how much drivers can be charged for rental and lease fees of taxis by the taxi companies and cooperatives. In addition, drivers should be able to participate in medical and insurance programs. Security and opportunities in the industry must include all of its stakeholders: taxi companies, taxi cooperatives, permit holders, drivers, and the public.

(c) Stable Industry. In order to promote a more stable taxi industry, it is important to encourage young people to join the industry. Since the passage of Proposition K in 1978, turnover of taxi permits (licenses to operate taxis) has been slower than expected, discouraging young people from joining the industry. The line for permit applicants is backlogged, forcing an applicant to wait twenty years to obtain a permit. In order to achieve greater participation, we need a more rapid turnover of taxicab permits.

The current system has created absentee owners who have forced up the price of permits for drivers. Drivers pay more for rental and lease fees paid to cab companies, while their meter rates have remained frozen.

This public interest ordinance reforming taxicab operations addresses all of these issues.

Section 2. Taxicab Permits

(a) In addition to those requirements and qualifications provided by law, the Police Commission shall only issue a permit to operate a taxicab to a natural person who has for five (5) of the ten (10) years immediately preceding the issuance of the permit actively driven a taxicab in the city and county, on a full-time basis; provided, however, permits may be issued pursuant to Section 7 of this Ordinance.

(b) Whether submitted before or after the effective date of this Ordinance, applications for taxicab permits shall be processed and considered in the order of their position on the list of applicants maintained by the Chief of Police. Such applications do not constitute nor do they create vested property interests in the applicant but are instead in the nature of an expectancy.

(c) Qualifications for and limitations upon the issuance of permits to operate a taxicab, including the active driver provisions of applicable law, shall continue to have no effect upon those natural persons who held one or more taxicab permits on June 6, 1978.

(d) Subject to approval of the Chief of Police, which approval shall not unreasonably be withheld, each color scheme permit holder may employ a reasonable number of managers to oversee its operations who also hold a permit to operate a taxicab. During the period of such employment, the requirement of active driving set forth in Appendix F to the charter of the city and county shall, if applicable, be suspended.

(e) The Police Commission may in its discretion suspend the requirement of active driving set forth in Appendix F to the charter of the city and county, if applicable, during any periods of disability or illness, incapacity due to age or other similar condition.

Section 3. Limitations on Rates of Fare and Related Charges.

(a) Any and all fees charged by or paid to a taxicab permit holder, whether by hire, rental, or lease agreement in whatever form, for the privilege of operating said permit or permits (herein "lease fees") and any and all fees charged to or paid by a driver, directly or indirectly, for the privilege of operating a taxicab permit for a specified period (herein "operating fees") shall be governed by and are hereafter subject to the provisions of this Ordinance.

(b) Except as otherwise expressly provided in this section, no permit holder shall charge or be paid lease fees in excess of those being charged by or paid to said permit holder as of May 1, 1996, and no driver may be charged or compelled to pay operating fees in excess of those in effect as of May 1, 1996.

(c) Commencing March 1, 1997, and biennially thereafter, the Controller shall determine and certify the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the two-year period ending January 1 of that same year, as shown by the consumer price index (CPI), United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review, or a successor publication. The rates of fare for taxicabs shall then be adjusted in accordance with the percentage change in the CPI, rounded upwards to the nearest cent, to take effect on April 1.

No single adjustment shall exceed 7.5% after aggregating the cumulative percentage change in the CPI since the last adjustment.

(d) On the same biennial schedule as rates of fare are adjusted, lease fees and operating fees may be adjusted upward and shall be adjusted downward if applicable, by no more than one-half of the percentage change certified by the Controller for rates of fare for taxicabs, rounded upwards to the nearest dollar.

This section shall have no application to bona fide collective bargaining agreements setting compensation and benefits paid to taxicab drivers.

(f) When a taxicab permit or color scheme permit is first acquired after May 1, 1996, lease and operating fees shall not be charged or paid in excess of the established rate thereof as of May 1, 1996, adjusted upward or downward as appropriate under subsection 3(d) above.

With the assistance of the Controller, the Chief of Police shall determine the established rate for lease fees calculated monthly, and operating fees on a per shift basis, by ascertaining the average rates therefor as of May 1, 1996. These rates shall be determined by means of a survey of the existing taxicab fleet conducted within sixty days of the effective date of this ordinance.

Section 4. Transferability of Permits.

(a) For a two year period from and after the effective date of this Ordinance, a person who has held a taxicab permit for at least ten years may transfer the permit for consideration to a natural person who (i) as of May 1, 1996 held a position on the list of applicants for taxicab permits maintained by the Chief of Police, and (ii) at the time of the transfer would be qualified for the issuance of a permit to operate a taxicab under subsection 2(a) above and applicable law.

No transfer may be made to a person who already possesses a taxicab permit, nor may any permit so transferred be maintained in more than one name.

(b) In order to transfer a taxicab permit as herein provided, the permit holder shall submit an application therefor to the Police Commission. On at least a biennial basis, the Commissioners (or his delegates) shall conduct a noticed public meeting where each permit for which an application for transfer has been received shall be made available to the person who (i) satisfies the criteria set forth in subsection 4(a) above, and (ii) offers the highest qualified bid therefor.

(c) No permit may be transferred unless and until (i) the city and county receives from the successful bidder a transfer fee in the amount of ten thousand dollars, or twenty percent of the consideration to be paid for the transfer of the permit, whichever is greater, and (ii) the Police Commission approves by resolution the transfer.

(d) The Police Commission shall issue guidelines to assist it in determining whether to accept a bid as qualified under this Ordinance. The guidelines shall include provisions designed to protect against profiteering in the transfer of permits and afford the maximum practicable access to the transfer process.

(e) After the expiration of the two year period provided in subsection 4(a) above, a permit may be transferred to a natural person who, at the time of the transfer, holds a position on the list of applicants for taxicab permits and who would be

(Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (Continued)

qualified for the issuance of a permit to operate a taxicab under applicable law.

(f) Upon the death of a permit holder, the permit(s) held shall revert to the city and county by law, subject to reissuance at the discretion of the Police Commission.

(g) Permits authorized by Section 7 of this Ordinance shall not be subject to transfer as provided herein.

Section 5. Health and Disability Insurance.

All color scheme permit holders shall provide to persons engaged to operate taxicab permits, including permit holders, the opportunity to participate in group health and disability insurance programs sponsored or afforded by the color scheme permit holder.

Section 6. Rules and Regulations.

The Police Commission shall have the exclusive authority, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors, to formulate, propose and adopt appropriate rules and regulations for the safe, efficient and lawful operation of taxicab permits, including provisions affecting training, education and testing of drivers; insurance; record keeping; and equipment deemed necessary for the safe transport of both drivers and passengers. The Commission shall also have the exclusive authority, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors, to propose and adopt fee schedules consistent herewith for the issuance and renewal of various permits and licenses required by law for the operation of taxicabs.

Section 7. Restricted Permits.

(a) Subject to the restrictions set forth in this section, the Police Commission is hereby directed to issue permits to operate a taxicab in the name of each color scheme permit holder that, on a quarterly basis, is certified by the paratransit broker as a participant in good standing in the paratransit program of the city and county. These permits shall be subject to immediate revocation by resolution of the Police Commission in the event the permit holder is decertified by the paratransit broker.

(b) The number of permits to be issued under this section shall at no time exceed 10% of the total taxicab fleet, calculated as of May 1, 1996. No color scheme permit holder shall be issued permits that exceed in number 10% of the total number of permits operated by the particular color scheme, calculated quarterly by the Chief of Police, rounded to the next lowest whole number. If fewer than 25 permits are operated, no permits as provided in this section shall be issued to the color scheme permit holder.

(c) Permits as in this section provided shall be continuously operated from 0600 on Monday through and including 0600 on Saturday, holidays excluded, and at no other times.

Section 8. Penalties.

(a) Any person violating a provision of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or an infraction, to be charged in the discretion of the District Attorney. Upon conviction of an infraction, the maximum fine is $100 and/or community service. If convicted of a misdemeanor, the fine is $500, community service, and/or imprisonment in the county jail for not more than seven days.

(b) In the event that any person operating a limousine, van or unlicensed taxicab is found in violation of permitting or operational provisions of Part II, Chapter VIII, Article 16 of the San Francisco Code (Police Code), specifically Sections 1078, 1140 and related sections thereof, the person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine up to $1,000, imprisonment in the county jail for six months, or both such fine and imprisonment.

(c) Any person found in violation of the provisions of Section 3 of this ordinance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine up to $5,000, imprisonment in the county jail for six months, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Section 9. Severability.

If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase of this Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or any part thereof. It is hereby declared that this Ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, clause or phrase thereof, would have been passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, clauses or phrases had been declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.

Section 10. Interpretation.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, rule or regulation to the contrary, the provisions of this ordinance shall govern and control the regulation and operation of taxicabs, taxicab permits and the other subjects generally and specifically referred to herein.

Section 11. Effective Date.

The effective date of this Ordinance is December 15, 1996.