

Matier & Ross, San Francisco Chronicle, November 2:

“If she wins, she would have to give up her seat — leaving it to the council’s four remaining members to pick a replacement. Because the Hatch Act applies only to campaigning, **Nihart could be eligible to be appointed to the vacant seat.** ‘That’s entirely up to the council,’ Nihart said. ‘But as a federal employee, I have to stop campaigning, and I can’t do any lobbying for that seat.’”

Matier & Ross quoting Kathy O'Connell, City Clerk, City of Pacifica:

"If Mary Ann Nihart is elected, Councilmember Nihart's letter to the City Clerk **effectively operates as a letter of resignation or intent to relinquish her office as of the end of her current term of office.** If Nihart is re-elected, the city would follow its normal vacancy-filling process, the city clerk said. ‘The City Council could fill the vacancy either by appointment or by calling a special election,’ said O'Connell."

Horatio (Handicapper) Hornblower:

“For a fact, Nihart could be appointed to any open council seat. She is prevented only from campaigning for election. A Martin-Nihart win would put Martin-Digre-Keener with all the cards. A Vaterlaus-Nihart win would put a Vaterlaus-O'Neill coalition against a Digre-Keener coalition, and they would probably appoint someone uncontroversial, like Tom Clifford. A Martin-Vaterlaus win (most likely) would leave no open seat, as would a Martin-Duffy or Vaterlaus-Duffy win (least likely).

