

**PROPOSED PROPOSITIONS TO  
RATIFY A RESOLUTION AND  
AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY CHARTER  
TOGETHER WITH ARGUMENTS**



To Be Submitted to the Qualified Voters  
of The City of San Diego at the

**MUNICIPAL PRIMARY ELECTION  
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 21, 1965**



The following proposed propositions for the ratification and approval of a resolution approving the General Plan for San Diego — 1985, and amendments to the Charter of The City of San Diego will be submitted to the qualified voters of The City of San Diego on Tuesday, September 21, 1965.

PHILLIP ACKER, City Clerk

PROPOSITION 1

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 1. Shall Resolution No. 183511 of The City of San Diego, adopted by the Council on April 22, 1965, which provides a General Plan for The City of San Diego, be approved?	YES	
	NO	

This proposition, which is Resolution No. 183511, approves a General Plan for the physical development of the City, and is submitted for approval pursuant to REFERENDUM PETITION.

Resolution No. 183511 reads as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 183511

WHEREAS, the Planning Law of the State of California requires that a General Plan shall be adopted by both the planning commission and the local legislative body prior to its being officially certified as such; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of The City of San Diego on March 24, 1965, adopted and recommended for approval to the City Council "The General Plan for San Diego—1985," consisting of a report, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. 679525, a statement of text revisions filed in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. 683837, and a map which is also on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. 683836; and

WHEREAS, the Council of The City of San Diego has held a public hearing to consider the adoption of said plan; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, as follows:

That this Council hereby adopts and officially certifies "The General Plan for San Diego—1985," as the comprehensive, long-term General Plan for the physical development of The City of San Diego.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Clerk is hereby directed to certify the adoption of "The General Plan for San Diego—1985" by this Council.

APPROVED: EDWARD T. BUTLER, City Attorney

Presented by.....

By Alexander A. Harper, Deputy

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on April 22, 1965, by the following vote:

YEAS—Councilmen: Cobb, de Kirby, Scheidle, Hitch, Hom, Walsh, Mayor Curran.

NAYS—Councilmen: None.

ABSENT—Councilmen: None.

AUTHENTICATED BY:

FRANK E. CURRAN,  
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.  
PHILLIP ACKER,  
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.  
By RUTH KLAUER, Deputy.

(SEAL)

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of RESOLUTION NO. 183511, passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego, California, April 22, 1965.

(SEAL) PHILLIP ACKER,  
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.  
By RUTH KLAUER, Deputy.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 1

Once again, good planning to assure the orderly growth of your city is under attack. Here are the facts about the General Plan for the City of San Diego.

The General Plan is the official statement of the City of San Diego setting forth its major policies concerning desirable future physical development. These policies are set forth on a map which shows how various areas of the City will be developed in the future.

The General Plan is the product of over four years of review, analysis and discussion by the City and over 200 dedicated citizens. After public hearings it was unanimously adopted by the Plan-

ning Commission on March 24, 1965. After some minor amendments it was unanimously adopted by the City Council after a public hearing on April 22, 1965.

The General Plan is flexible and by its terms must be periodically reassessed and modified.

Every successful enterprise is built upon well thought out plans to guide its future growth. Cities are no exception. Good planning protects and enhances property values. None of us want a junkyard to move in next door to our home. In thinking of the future, we need to know the location of freeways, parks, school sites and industrial areas.

The General Plan is not "socialism in action," nor an invitation to federal urban renewal projects. The General Plan is a sensible, sound set of guidelines and policies to help your City Council guide the future development of San Diego.

The General Plan deserves your "Yes" vote.

JOHN BUTLER, Chairman, Committee for the General Plan.

PAUL L. STUBBS, Peninsula Chamber of Commerce.

JIM GILLEAN, President, San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

TIM SELLEW, President, La Jollans, Inc.

HAMILTON MARSTON, President, San Diegans, Inc.

WALTER J. DE BRUNNER, Chairman, Citizens United for a Better San Diego.

EDWARD C. MADDIX, Member, Citizens Advisory Committee.

DORTHEA EDMISTON, President, Citizens Coordinate.

LEONARD ZLOTOFF, President, North Park Development Asso.

BILL MILLER, JR., Chairman, Mid City Development Council.

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Before voting please read the 151 page General Plan which is a detailed blueprint regulating community life in San Diego for the next 20 years.

We need a General Plan, but we believe This Plan should be defeated because:

- 1) It concentrates massive power in the hands of City Bureaucrats;
- 2) It is cleverly designed to introduce tax supported Federal Urban Renewal projects into San Diego. It opens the door for the "Federal Bulldozer" so promoters and fast buck speculators could carry out "redevelopment" and "renewal" schemes under direction of the scandal-ridden Federal Urban Renewal Agency, and all at taxpayers expense.

We agree with the Evening Tribune when it stated:

"The General Plan for the City of San Diego was written by the City Planning Department staff.

"If adopted, it will affect your life in San Diego in a very personal and overpowering manner.

"It indicates the kind of a city the city planning staff has decided San Diego should be by 1985.

"SAN DIEGANS SHOULD CAREFULLY examine the General Plan . . . which is designed to permit the city to qualify for federal grants of taxpayers' money for urban renewal projects.

"Adoption of the proposal for putting the plan into effect could put development of every piece of private property in the city in the hands of city officials.

"IF YOU DO NOT WANT CITY HALL to rule every condition under which you live and work in San Diego, including where you live and work, you must protest now.

"If you do not, you will awaken some morning to find that by your negligence, the heavy, stifling hand of officialdom will be ruling your life." (Editorial—Evening Tribune, July 27, 1964.)

This is the last opportunity the voters will have to vote on any future urban renewal project. DON'T GIVE IT AWAY. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 1.

CITIZEN'S PROTECTIVE LEAGUE,

By: M. J. MONTROY, Chairman.

E. B. WADE.

PROPOSITION 2

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 2. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 12 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend fifth paragraph of Section 12 to provide compensation of each Councilman equal to a member of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends the fifth paragraph of Section 12 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 12. THE COUNCIL. The Council shall be composed of nine (9) Councilmen, including the Mayor, and shall be the legislative body of the City, each of the members of which, including the Mayor, shall have the right to vote upon all questions before it.

Councilmen, including the Mayor, shall be elected at a general municipal election held in the odd numbered years and, except as hereinafter provided, shall hold office for the term of four years from and after the first Monday after the first day of December next succeeding their election and until their successors are elected and qualified. Upon any redistricting pursuant to the provisions of this Charter, incumbent councilmen will continue to represent the district in which they reside, unless as a result of such redistricting more than one incumbent councilman resides within any one district, in which case the City Council shall determine by lot which councilman shall represent each district. At the next municipal primary and general elections following a redistricting, councilmen shall be elected from those districts not represented and from those districts represented by incumbent councilmen whose terms expire as of the general election in said year. If as a result of any redistricting more than a simple majority of the City Council as redistricted shall be elected at the general election next following any such redistricting, the City Council prior to any such election shall designate one or more new districts for which the initial councilmanic term shall be two (2) years in order to retain staggered terms for councilmen.

Any vacancy occurring in the Council shall be filled from the District in which the vacancy occurs by appointment by the remaining ~~of~~ councilmen; but in the event that said remaining ~~of~~ councilmen fail to fill such vacancy by appointment within thirty (30) days after the vacancy occurs, they must immediately cause an election to be held to fill such vacancy; provided, however, that any person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office only until the next regular municipal election, at which date a person shall be elected to serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

It is the duty of councilmen to attend all Council meetings. The absence of any councilmen from eight (8) consecutive meetings or fifty per cent (50%) of any scheduled meetings within a month shall operate to vacate the seat of such councilman, unless the absence thereof is excused by resolution of the Council.

~~The rate of pay of each Councilman shall be Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000.00) a year.~~

No councilman during his term of office shall receive any compensation from the City for services rendered to the City except as provided in this Section. Each councilman shall receive as annual compensation from the City for services rendered to the City an amount equal to, but not greater than, the amount now or hereafter provided by law as annual compensation for a member of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego.

No ~~of~~ councilman shall be eligible during the term for which he was appointed or elected to hold any other office or employment with the City, except as Mayor and a member of any Board, Commission or Committee thereof, of which he is constituted such a member by general law or by this Charter.

## ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 2

Council responsibilities and decisions are no less important or far reaching in your future than those of the Board of Supervisors.

Councilmen for the City of San Diego have not had a salary adjustment since 1956. Thoughtful citizens will give serious consideration to the adjustments and increases in salaries and/or income during the intervening years in other branches of government and private enterprise.

Council legislation and direction to solve local problems by the local government is practically a full time, not a part time, job. Since 1956, the City of San Diego's growing population of 648,000 has reflected an increase of 50%. This has caused proportionate increases during that time in the weight of responsibility borne by Councilmen, both to their increased number of constituents and to the importance and scope of vital issues of good municipal government. Issues, problems, budgetary considerations, and general responsibilities have reached such a magnitude that a Councilman must necessarily devote most of his time to research, study, and difficult pursuits of knowledge which enable him to reach sound judgements and make proper decisions in legislative sessions.

Salaries of elected officials should be high enough that candidates with exceptional energies, time, and talent can be attracted to public office. Voters can provide the means by which any qualified citizen will be able to occupy the office without necessity of outside income.

For these reasons, every voter should support this salary adjustment in the interests of good government.

Vote YES on Proposition 2.

WALTER A. DEWHURST  
DR. JOHN R. FORD  
GORDON C. LUCE

## ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 2

If this amendment is adopted the salaries of eight councilmen will be raised from five thousand dollars to twelve thousand five hundred dollars per year, an unjustifiable increase of two hundred fifty per cent.

Because this amendment ties the salaries of councilmen to those of the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, any increase in salaries for Supervisors will be an additional automatic increase for City Councilmen without a vote of the people.

If and when councilmen are required to work full time for the City of San Diego, then they should receive full time pay. Until that time, it seems to this citizen, that five thousand dollars yearly is just compensation for one meeting a week as presently required by law.

WILLIAM R. MCKINLEY  


## PROPOSITION 3

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 3. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 24 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend second paragraph of Section 24 to provide compensation of the Mayor equal to a Municipal Court Judge of the San Diego Judicial District.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends the second paragraph of Section 24 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 24. MAYOR. The Mayor shall preside at the meetings of the Council and perform such

other duties as may be prescribed by this Charter or as may be imposed by the Council, consistent with the duties of his office. He shall have no power of veto, but shall have a vote as a member of the Council. He shall be recognized as the official head of the City for all ceremonial purposes, by the courts for the purpose of serving civil process, for the signing of all legal instruments and documents, and by the Governor for military purposes. On or before the 15th day of January of each year, he shall communicate by message to the City Council a statement of the conditions and affairs of the City, and make recommendations on such matters as he may deem expedient and proper. In time of public danger or emergency, he may, with the consent of the Council, take command of the police, maintain order and enforce the law.

~~The rate of pay of the Mayor shall be \$12,000.00 per year.~~

No person during his term of office as Mayor shall receive any compensation from the City for services rendered to the City except as provided in this Section. The Mayor shall receive as annual compensation from the City for services rendered to the City an amount equal to, but not greater than, the amount now or hereafter provided by law as annual compensation for a judge of the Municipal Court of the San Diego Judicial District.

In the event of a vacancy occurring in the office of the Mayor, existing by reason of any cause, the Council shall have authority to fill such vacancy; provided, however, that if the Council shall fail to fill such vacancy by appointment within thirty (30) days after the vacancy, the Council must immediately cause an election to be held to fill such vacancy. Any person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office only until the next regular municipal election, at which date a person shall be elected to serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 3

The Mayor of the City of San Diego is forced by demands of the governmental problems of a city of 648,000 people to devote full time to his responsibilities. In this case, full time does not mean the normal daytime working hours, but must include, in addition, the insistent demands for public appearances at night and on weekends.

It should be particularly noted that the Mayor has received no salary increase since 1956, but his weight of responsibility, legally required and normally imposed, has greatly increased. In 1956 San Diego's population was 481,900 people. The increases in the weight of responsibility borne by the Mayor, not only to his constituents but in degree of importance of the decisions on municipal issues which he is required to make, have grown in importance. Many employees of city government in San Diego are paid far higher salaries than its Mayor. Other public servants, such as municipal judges, and other governmental management administrators, both in the County and the State and other cities in the State of California, receive salaries commensurate with the weight of responsibility imposed by their positions.

Salaries of elected officials should be high enough so that major energies, time, and talent can be devoted to public interests, rather than that elected officials should be forced to seek supplementary incomes in order to live.

The Mayor of the City of San Diego must ponder issues, problems, budgetary considerations, and general responsibilities, and he must research and study in order to qualify his decisions on the basis of sound judgement and full knowledge so that he serves wisely the interests of the greatest number of people.

For these reasons, every voter should support this salary adjustment in the interest of good government.

WALTER A. DEWHURST  
DR. JOHN R. FORD  
GORDON C. LUCE

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 3

For the second time in 12 months the Mayor is asking the voters for a pay raise. Last year he asked for a 50% increase, but the people voted NO, 2 to 1. Now, less than a year later, he is asking for a 100% increase (\$12,000 to \$18,000). Although the proposition is cleverly worded to conceal the exact amount of the increase, if this proposition is approved the Mayor's salary will jump from \$12,000 to \$24,000.

In private business, salary increases are based on performance and it should be no different for elected officials whose salaries are fixed and paid by the taxpayers. The question then is: Has the Mayor rendered such an outstanding performance during the past two years to merit his salary being doubled? The answer is obvious — he has not.

The record shows, since taking office:

1. Cost of city government has jumped to a new high (during first year in office population increased 2%, while expenditures increased 6%; during second year, population increased .06% while expenditures increased 4%).
2. The Mayor increased the budget of his own office by more than 20% during the first year in office.
3. Unemployment worse than ever — over 8%, new high, while national average only 4.9%.
4. Mayor said new industry would be harmful to San Diego.

It is not suggested that the Office of Mayor of San Diego does not warrant a salary increase, provided responsible leadership and management of fiscal affairs goes with the increase. It is suggested that San Diego cannot afford \$75,000.00 for the Mayor's office PLUS \$140,000.00 for the City Manager's office.

LET'S TRY SOME ECONOMY FIRST  
VOTE NO ON 3

UNITED TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO  
 COUNTY, INC.  
 San Diego Chapter  
 BY: JAMES K. CHRISTIE

PROPOSITION 4

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 4. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 7 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend first paragraph of Section 7 to permit registered voters twenty-one (21) years of age who satisfy resident requirements to be eligible to hold elective office of the City.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends Section 7 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 7. ELECTIVE OFFICERS. No person shall be eligible to or hold any elective office of the City, either by election or appointment, ~~unless he shall have been a resident and elector thereof for at least three years next preceding his election or appointment and shall have been an elector~~ thereof and a registered voter eligible to vote at the time of his election or appointment.

In addition to the foregoing qualifications, every Councilman must have been at the time of his election, or appointment in the event of a vacancy, an actual resident in the district from which he was nominated for one year immediately preceding his election or appointment. Any Councilman who moves from the district of which he was a resident at the time of his election or appointment forfeits his office, but no Councilman shall forfeit his office as a result of redistricting ~~;~~ provided, however, that the one year's residency requirement established by the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the first councilmanic election following the amendment of Section 4 of Article II of this Charter.

### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 4

The voting public has the choice of accepting or rejecting a candidate. Restrictions should be minimal.

Requirements for holding public office should be consistent with requirements for voting.

The 21 year age limit has proved satisfactory in Los Angeles, Long Beach, Sacramento, and many other California cities.

The age requirement for State Assembly and State Senate is 21 years. Requirements for city office need be no stronger than these state requirements.

Age is not necessarily a true measure of a person's ability to make valid contributions to city government. A 21 year old, interested enough in the City to run for office, is not likely to be as "wet behind the ears" as some people would like to think.

JOHN FOULTZ

### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 4

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.

### PROPOSITION 5

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 5. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Repeal Section 119 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Repeal Section 119 thereby eliminating the application register for civil service tests.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition repeals Section 119 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. The text of Section 119 is printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE.

~~Section 119. APPLICATION REGISTER. There shall be kept in the office of the Civil Service Commission an application register, in which shall be entered the names and addresses and the order and date of application of all applicants for Civil Service tests and the offices or employments which they seek. All applications shall be upon forms prescribed by the Commission.~~

### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 5

Section 119. APPLICATION REGISTER. Repeal of Charter Section 119 is recommended by the Civil Service Commission. This procedure is no longer of any practical use and is impossible to administer in modern day nation-wide recruiting.

All the Civil Service Commissioners join me in urging you to vote YES on this proposition.

MILDRED PERRY WAITE, President  
San Diego City Civil Service Commission

### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 5

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.

### PROPOSITION 6

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 6. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 122 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend Section 122 to establish new Civil Service employment eligibility rules.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends Section 122 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.



Section 122. APPOINTMENTS. When any position in the ~~Classified~~ Service is to be filled, the appointing authority shall notify the Personnel Director, who shall promptly certify to such authority the names and addresses of the ~~highest three~~ eligibles on the list for the class or grade to which the position belongs. The number of eligibles certified shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission and published in its Rules. The appointing authority shall appoint to such position one of the persons whose names are so certified. When no eligible list for the position exists, or when the eligible list has become exhausted, and until a new list can be created, a name may be certified from the eligible list most nearly appropriate to the position to be filled.

#### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 6

Section 122. APPOINTMENTS. Amendment to Charter Section 122 is recommended by the Civil Service Commission so as to eliminate the specific references to the number of eligibles (3) to be certified to City appointing authorities, thus allowing for a broader selection of eligibles for employment and promotion by the department and division heads of the City.

To illustrate the restrictiveness of the certification law as it is now written: if the Police Chief wants 40 new Patrolmen, the Commission, under present law, can only send 42 eligibles, leaving the Police Chief almost no freedom of choice.

The Commission will discuss several more liberal alternatives with representatives of management and City employees. Following these discussions, the Commission will publicly present one or more certification plans to the City Council as amendments to Civil Service Rules, which are part of the Municipal Code.

All of the Civil Service Commissioners join me in urging you to vote YES on this proposition.

MILDRED PERRY WAITE, President  
San Diego City Civil Service Commission

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 6

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.

#### PROPOSITION 7

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

<p>PROPOSITION 7. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Repeal Sections 140 and 140a of the Charter of The City of San Diego.</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Repeal Section 140 thereby eliminating the requirement that employees of public utilities acquired by the City be placed under Civil Service; repeal Section 140a thereby eliminating the six-month probationary period for Civil Service employees.</p>	<p>NO</p>	

This proposition repeals Sections 140 and 140a of the Charter of The City of San Diego. The text of Sections 140 and 140a is printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE.

~~Section 140. PRESENT EMPLOYEES RETAINED. All officers and employees in the classified or unclassified service of the City at the time this Charter becomes effective as provided in Section 212 of Article XIV hereof, shall automatically retain their positions and shall thereafter be superseded, replaced, discharged, reduced in rank, promoted, transferred, or retired, only in accordance with the provisions of this Charter. Employees of any public utility taken over by the City, who are in the service of such utility at the time of its acquisition, shall be deemed to hold their positions as though appointed under the Civil Service provisions of this Charter; but vacancies thereafter occurring in such service shall be filled from eligible lists in the manner herein provided.~~

Section 140a. STATUS OF PRESENT EMPLOYEES. All officers, and employees who at the time of the taking effect of this section would be included in the classified service and who shall have been continuously in the service of the City for a period of six (6) months prior to the effective date of this section, shall automatically retain their positions as if duly appointed thereto as of the date of their original appointment in accordance with the provisions of this Charter and the Civil Service Rules, and shall be deemed to have the necessary qualifications required by the provisions thereof, and thereafter be superseded, replaced, discharged, reduced in rank, promoted, transferred or retired only in accordance with the provisions of this Charter. All officers and employees who at the time of the taking effect of this section would be included in the classified service, but who have been in the service of the City for a period of less than six (6) months, shall be deemed to be serving under probation and be subject to the same regulations as other officers and employees serving under probation as provided by the Civil Service Rules.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 7

Section 140, PRESENT EMPLOYEES RETAINED, and 140-a, STATUS OF PRESENT EMPLOYEES. Repeal of these Sections is recommended by the Civil Service Commission because they are no longer needed, having been established many years ago to solve particular one-time problems.

All of the Civil Service Commissioners join me in urging you to vote YES on this proposition.

MILDRED PERRY WAITE, President  
San Diego Civil Service Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 7

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.

PROPOSITION 8

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 8. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 92 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend Section 92 to permit short term borrowing to be repaid out of taxes collected during the fiscal year.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends Section 92 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 92. BORROWING MONEY ON SHORT TERM NOTES. ~~If there is not sufficient cash reserve to meet current obligations, bonds~~ Bonds or notes may be issued in anticipation of the collection of special assessments, and bonds, notes, or registered warrants on the treasury may be issued in anticipation of the collection of taxes, as authorized by the City Council by ordinance resolution and shall not be deemed the creation of debt within the meaning of Section 90 of this Article. Bonds, notes, or registered warrants on the treasury issued in anticipation of the collection of the taxes of any fiscal year ~~shall~~ may be issued ~~only~~ during the ~~first four months or other necessary period of~~ each fiscal year and each such bond, note, or warrant shall specify that it is payable ~~solely~~ out of the ~~first~~ taxes of the fiscal year in which issued, and before the close of such year, and shall not bear a higher rate of interest than five (5) per cent per annum, and the total amount of such bonds, notes or warrants, authorized and issued in any fiscal year shall not, in the aggregate, be more than twenty-five (25) per cent of the total appropriations of the City for such year. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the incurring of an obligation against the municipality in excess of that authorized to be incurred by the ~~e~~ Constitution of the State of California.

## ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 8

Each year, prior to the collection of taxes, it is necessary for the City of San Diego to engage in temporary borrowing in order to have money in its tax supported funds to pay the running expenses of the City. Property taxes are the only source of revenue to meet the payments for bond interest and bond maturities as well as for social security and retirement, and these come due before tax collections are received from the County. The General Fund, too, must borrow to meet current running expenses as the carry-over cash balance and non-property tax revenues during the first six months do not meet the requirements for cash expenditure for this same period.

The Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance recommended that the City borrow on short-term notes from financial institutions the monies needed by tax supported funds prior to the receipt of property taxes, and thereby take advantage of the City's ability to borrow at low interest rates because of the tax advantage to the lending institution. The Treasurer at present is able to invest certain restricted funds but, because of the City's need to meet the lean period prior to the receipt of tax collections, he has been compelled to invest these funds in short-term securities only. With short-term borrowing from financial institutions, the Treasurer could invest in longer term securities at yields greater than the City's borrowing costs.

This amendment is financially sound, would result in a savings to the City, and would allow the City under its Charter to borrow by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the same manner as is possible for other cities operating under the Government Code of the State of California.

Vote YES on Proposition 8.

BYRON F. WHITE, General Chairman  
Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance

## ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 8

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.

## PROPOSITION 9

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

PROPOSITION 9. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 35 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. Amend second paragraph of Section 35 to authorize Purchasing Agent to purchase supplies, materials, equipment and insurance up to \$5,000.00 without formal bidding or Council approval.	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends the second paragraph of Section 35 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 35. PURCHASING AGENT. The Purchasing Agent shall make all purchases of supplies, materials, equipment, and insurance required by the various Departments or offices of the City, except as may be otherwise provided by the Council or this Charter. He shall prepare in consultation with the administrative officers of the City standard specifications for all supplies, materials, equipment, and insurance necessary for use by the various Departments or offices of the City.

In purchasing any supplies, materials, equipment and insurance required by the various Departments or offices of the City, if the cost of said supplies, materials, equipment and insurance exceeds in amount the sum of \$5,000.00, no such purchase shall be made without advertising for sealed proposals therefor. Notices calling for such sealed proposals shall be published for one day in the official newspaper of the City, and a contract let for such purpose only after the expiration of ten days following said advertising. ~~If the cost of the said supplies, materials, equipment and insurance required by said City exceeds the sum of \$1,000.00, but is not in excess of \$5,000.00, the said~~

~~purchase may be made by said Purchasing Agent without advertising for sealed proposals, but not until said Purchasing Agent has secured competitive prices from merchants or other persons interested in making the sale to said City and not until the Purchasing Agent has been authorized by the Council to make such purchase. Purchases of supplies, materials, equipment and insurance required by the various Departments or offices of the City which do not exceed the sum of \$1,000.00-\$5,000.00 in cost may be made by the Purchasing Agent directly upon the request of the department interested, but not until said Purchasing Agent has secured competitive prices from merchants or other persons interested in making the sale to said City.~~

The Council shall by ordinance provide for the sale, exchange or other disposal by the Purchasing Agent of any surplus, used, obsolete or depreciated personal property belonging to the City.

The Council by resolution may order the purchase without advertising for bids of surplus commodities from the United States of America, or any agency thereof, or from any other public corporation, state or municipal, or any agency thereof. The Council may also authorize said Purchasing Agent to sell to any other public corporation, state or municipal, any supplies, material and equipment which said City may have been able to purchase in quantity at a reduced price.

Supplies shall be furnished upon requisition either from the stores under the control of the Purchasing Agent or by purchase, and whenever so purchased shall be paid for by the Department or office furnished therewith. It shall be the duty of the Purchasing Agent to inspect or cause to be inspected all purchases, and reject any of those which are not up to the standard specifications provided therefor, and he shall not approve any bid or voucher for articles which are not in conformity with specifications, or which are at variance with any contract. The Purchasing Agent shall not furnish supplies to any Department or office unless there be to the credit thereof an available unencumbered balance sufficient to pay for such supplies.

Materials, supplies or equipment not needed by a Department or office, but necessary to another Department or office, may be transferred by the Purchasing Agent and a proper record made of the transaction. He shall have charge of such storerooms and warehouses of the City as the Manager may provide or the Council by ordinance may authorize. The Council may, upon recommendation of the Manager, authorize the Purchasing Agent to purchase materials, supplies, or equipment in common use by the Departments and offices in large quantities and store the same until requisitioned by the Departments or offices for use. The Council shall provide a sufficient revolving fund in the annual appropriation ordinance of an adequate amount for the purpose of creating a store's account and stock for future supply of the Departments and offices when needed.

The Purchasing Agent shall keep a record of all sources of supply, of all quotations received, of all awards made, of all inspections, of all requisitions filed, and of all vendors furnishing commodities to the City. He shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by general law or ordinance or by the Manager.

#### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 9

Section 35 of the City Charter presently provides that all purchases in excess of \$1,000 must be authorized by the City Council. Proposition 9 authorizes the Purchasing Agent to negotiate and issue purchase orders up to \$5,000 after obtaining competitive prices but without formal bidding or Council approval. Formal bidding procedures will still be required on all purchases in excess of \$5,000.

The passage of Proposition 9 would allow the Purchasing Agent to make more efficient and economical purchases under competitive conditions unhampered by present restrictions and would release the Mayor and Council from unnecessary administrative detail, thus enabling them to spend more time on important policy matters.

We recommend passage of Proposition 9.

BYRON F. WHITE, General Chairman  
Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 9

If adopted this amendment will allow the City Purchasing Agent to make purchases up to \$5,000 on the request of a city department head without the consent or approval of the City Council.

Numerous such purchases could run into several hundreds of thousands of dollars with absolute-ly no control by the City Council, the elected representatives of the people.

The Council is elected to look after the interests of the people. It is the duty of the Council to carefully check and control the use of public funds. It should retain control of all purchases in excess of \$1,000 as presently provided in the Charter. The amendment should be defeated.

WILLIAM R. MCKINLEY



PROPOSITION 10

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

<p>PROPOSITION 10. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. Amend Section 94 of the Charter of The City of San Diego.</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Amend first paragraph of Section 94 to authorize the City Manager to contract for public works up to \$5,000:00 without formal bidding or Council approval.</p>	<p>NO</p>	

This proposition amends the first paragraph of Section 94 of the Charter of The City of San Diego by deleting certain provisions thereof and by the addition of new provisions. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

Section 94. **CONTRACTS.** In the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities and other public works, and in furnishing supplies, materials, equipment or contractual services for the same, when the expenditure therefor shall exceed the sum of ~~\$2,500.00~~ \$5,000.00, the same shall be done by written contract, except as otherwise provided in this Charter, and the Council, on the recommendation of the Manager or the head of the Department in charge if not under the Manager's jurisdiction, shall let the same to the lowest responsible and reliable bidder, not less than ten days after advertising for one day in the official newspaper of the City for sealed proposals for the work contemplated. If the cost of said public contract work ~~exceeds the sum of \$1,000.00~~, but is not in excess of ~~\$2,500.00~~ \$5,000.00, the ~~Council~~ City Manager may let said contract without advertising for bids, but not until the Purchasing Agent of the City shall have secured competitive prices from contractors interested, which shall be taken under consideration by ~~said Council~~ the City Manager before said contract is let. The Council may, however, upon the recommendation of the Manager and by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected to the Council, order the performance of any such construction and reconstruction or repair work by appropriate ~~City~~ City forces when the estimates submitted as part of the Manager's recommendation indicate that the work can be done by the ~~City~~ City forces more economically than if let by contract.

In case of a great public calamity, such as extraordinary fire, flood, storm, epidemic or other disaster the Council may, by resolution passed by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected to the Council, determine and declare that the public interest or necessity demands the immediate expenditure of public money to safeguard life, health or property, and thereupon they may proceed, without advertising for bids or receiving the same, to expend, or enter into a contract involving the

expenditure of any sum required in such emergency, on hand in the City treasury and available for such purpose. All contracts before execution shall be approved as to form and legality by the City Attorney.

Each bidder shall furnish with his bid such security or deposit insuring the execution of the contract by him as shall be specified by the Council or as provided by general law.

The Council shall require each contractor under this Section to insure the faithful performance of his contract by delivering to the City a surety bond in an amount specified by the Council, executed by a surety company authorized to do business in the State of California, and in addition thereto, the retention of sufficient payments under the contract to insure the protection of the City against labor or material liens.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Manager, or the Head of the Department not under the jurisdiction of the Manager, may reject any and all bids and readvertise for bids. The Council may provide that no contract shall be awarded to any person, firm or corporation if prison or alien labor is to be employed in performing such contract, or if the wage schedule for employees engaged in performing such contract is based on more than eight hours of labor per day. Any contract may be let for a gross price or on a unit basis and may provide for liquidated damages to the City for every day the contract is uncompleted beyond a specified date. It shall be competent in awarding any contract to compare bids on the basis of time completion, provided that when any award has been made in consideration, in whole or in part, of the relative time estimates of bidders for the completion of the work, the performance in accordance with such time limits shall be secured by a surety bond as hereinabove provided with adequate sureties and penalties, and provided further, that for any contract awarded solely or partially on a specified time for completion the Council shall not extend such time limits unless such extension be recommended by the Manager and the Head of the Department concerned.

No officer, whether elected or appointed, of The City of San Diego shall be or become directly or indirectly interested in, or in the performance of, any contract with or for The City of San Diego, or in the purchase or lease of any property, real or personal, belonging to or taken by said City or which shall be sold for taxes or assessments or by virtue of legal process or suit of said City. Any person wilfully violating this section of the Charter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall immediately forfeit his office and be thereafter forever barred and disqualified from holding any elective or appointive office in the service of the City. No officer, whether elected or appointed, shall be construed to have an interest within the meaning of this section unless the contract, purchase, lease, or sale shall be with or for the benefit of the office, board, department, bureau or division with which said officer is directly connected in the performance of his duties and in which he or the office, board, department, bureau or division he represents exercises legislative, administrative or quasi-judicial authority in the letting of or performance under said contract, purchase, lease or sale.

All contracts entered into in violation of this Section shall be void and shall not be enforceable against said City; provided, however, that officers of this municipality may own stock in public utility service corporations and the City permitted to contract for public utility service when the rates for such service are fixed by law or by virtue of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; and provided further, that no officer shall be prohibited from purchasing the services of any utility whether publicly or privately owned, whether or not the rates are fixed by law or by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; and provided further, that in designating any bank

as a depository for the funds of said City, any officer interested as a stockholder or otherwise in such bank shall not be deemed to have an interest in such City contract within the meaning of this section, and in each of the cases enumerated herein such contracts shall be valid and enforceable obligations against the municipality.

#### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 10

Section 94 of the City Charter presently provides that contracts for construction, reconstruction, or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities, or other public works which exceed the sum of \$1,000 must be authorized by the City Council. Also, it further provides that all contracts over \$2,500 must have formal bids. The Mayor's Committee has recommended that the City negotiate and enter into contracts up to \$5,000 for construction or repairs without formal bidding or Council approval. Proposition 10 embodies these recommendations.

At present, there is a great reluctance on the part of contractors to take jobs under \$5,000 when they must submit bid bonds and performance bonds, which are required with formal bids. Informal bidding up to \$5,000 would eliminate the necessity of the Engineering Department to spend many hours in the preparation of elaborate formal bid specifications for small jobs. Informal bids up to \$5,000 would stimulate competition and result in a significant savings to the City. Standard specifications would still be used, competitive prices secured and inspection procedures followed to insure that the City obtain quality performance at lowest cost.

We recommend passage of Proposition 10.

BYRON F. WHITE, General Chairman  
Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 10

If adopted, this amendment will give the City Manager complete control of the letting of numerous contracts up to \$5,000 each without the consent or approval of the Council.

The Council will be relinquishing control of hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money, and therefore depriving the people of a careful scrutiny of public expenditures by their elected representatives.

It will concentrate additional power in the hands of an already powerful City Manager.

For the above reasons this amendment should be defeated.

WILLIAM R. MCKINLEY



PROPOSITION 11

(THIS PROPOSITION WILL APPEAR ON THE BALLOT IN THE FOLLOWING FORM)

<p>PROPOSITION 11. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT.                  Repeal Section 95 of the Charter of The City of San Diego.</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Repeal Section 95 thereby eliminating the five per cent (5%)                  local preference in bidding.</p>	<p>NO</p>	

This proposition repeals Section 95 of the Charter of The City of San Diego. The text of Section 95 is printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE.

~~Section 95. PREFERENCE IN ACCEPTING BIDS. Any board, officer, commission or department empowered by this Charter to award contracts for goods, wares, merchandise, stores, supplies, drugs, subsistence, materials, equipment, tools, or other products of industry or manufacture, the cost or expense of which is to be paid by the City or any board, office, commission or department thereof, may award a contract for the purchase, sale and furnishing thereof to a regular bidder other than the lowest responsible bidder therefor, when, in the judgment of such awarding board, officer, commission or department, the best interests of the City and the public policy relating to the general welfare will be subserved thereby, and when the bidder specifies in his bid the following terms and conditions to be observed in the execution of the contract and he furnishes additional security for the fulfillment thereof, to wit:~~

~~That the articles, products or materials are to be in whole or in part manufactured, made or produced in industries established in The City of San Diego or in the County of San Diego, specifying the name and location thereof; or that the articles, products or materials are regularly stocked, handled and sold by business establishments located in The City of San Diego or in the County of San Diego, specifying the name and location of such establishments.~~

~~Provided, however, that the bid of such higher bidder does not in amount or price exceed by five per cent that of the lowest responsible bidder for such contract.~~

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 11

Section 95 of the City Charter provides for the grant of a 5% local preference to bidders located in San Diego County. There is no differentiation in the law between an out-of-county salesman who rents office space in San Diego and stocks a few commodities behind his desk, and that of a giant supply house with an inventory running into hundreds of thousands of dollars, on which it pays taxes. Moreover, local firms are able to compete with out-of-town businesses without a built-in Charter preference. At present, a few companies selling items needed by the City in effect receive a subsidy at the expense of the taxpayer, including most other businesses.

The present law marks San Diego as a protectionist and provincial city at a time when we are actively soliciting industry and tourist business from other areas. A "City in Motion" should encourage unrestricted competition.

We recommend passage of Proposition 11.

BYRON F. WHITE, General Chairman  
 Mayor's Committee on Municipal Finance

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 11

No argument against this proposition was filed in the Office of the City Clerk.