

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO PROPOSITIONS

•

**THREE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND ISSUES,  
INITIATIVE ON COASTAL ZONE BUILDING HEIGHT,  
HOUSING PROPOSAL FOR ELDERLY LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS,  
TOGETHER WITH ARGUMENTS.**

•

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

**SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION  
TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY,  
NOVEMBER 7, 1972**

•

The arguments in support or opposition of the  
propositions are the opinions of the authors.

EDWARD NIELSEN  
City Clerk

**PROPOSITION B**

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

**PROPOSITION B. CITY OF SAN DIEGO BALBOA PARK ELECTRIC BUILDING CASA DEL PACIFICO BOND PROPOSAL.**

To augment any funds available from private or public sources and to improve, develop and expand the historical, educational, and recreational services of The City of San Diego shall the City incur a bonded indebtedness in the principal amount of Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) to permit the acquisition, construction, or completion of a new structure to be known as Casa del Pacifico to replace the old Electric Building in Balboa Park?

YES	
NO	

This proposition requires a two-thirds vote.

**TAX RATE STATEMENT**

The estimated tax rate necessary to finance the principal and interest of the proposed bond issue for the acquisition, construction or completion of the Balboa Park Electric Building during the fiscal year 1973-74 is one and thirty-four one-hundredths cents (\$0.0134) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City. It is estimated that the highest tax rate required to finance the principal and interest of this bond issue will be two and thirty-two one-hundredths cents (\$0.0232) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City and that tax rate will occur in the fiscal year 1977-78.

W. G. SAGE  
City Auditor and Comptroller

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION B**

By approving bonds for rebuilding the Electric Building in permanent form on its present site in Balboa Park, San Diego voters have an opportunity to take the second necessary step in preserving the architectural beauty of the world-famous Prado, the avenue of magnificent buildings surrounded by tropical gardens. This is the cultural, recreational, educational heart of the city, enjoyed by all—unique in the U. S.

The first step was taken four years ago when voters approved the rebuilding of the Food and Beverage Building, now magnificent Casa del Prado, used by thousands of citizens.

The unique Spanish-Colonial buildings lining the Prado were erected for the 1915 Exposition, and were architectural attractions that drew world-wide applause. Because of lack of funds they were constructed of temporary materials. In the 57 years since their construction, San Diegans' affection for them has grown so strong that six attempts to raze these buildings have met with defeat. Now the threatened Electric Building must be replaced.

When these buildings were constructed San Diego was a city of 40,000. Now it is 15 times larger, and the need for them has grown accordingly. To fail to replace them with permanent structures is unthinkable. To rebuild the Electric Building as a permanent structure, comparable to Casa del Prado, across the avenue, would insure for future generations the preservation of San Diego's heritage. It would provide an exciting new cultural, educational center with a variety of uses for the people.

Rebuilding the Electric Building, which has been designated an Historic Site, would take nothing away from open space with which Balboa Park is so generously endowed.

This may be your last chance to preserve the architectural beauty and charm of your world-famous Balboa Park. Vote Yes on Proposition B.

BEA EVENSON

HARRY STANDEFER  
EDWARD T. AUSTIN

FREDERICK K. KUNZEL  
SAMUEL W. HAMILL

### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This bond proposal was sent to the voters despite unanimous opposition by the Park and Recreation Board. Also the San Diego Chamber of Commerce and the Taxpayers' Association strongly opposed this. It will prevent development of green, open space in the Park; add enormously to congestion and to traffic problems, earmark critically needed city funds for an unneeded building, and do all this in the name of "preserving" in concrete a building which its own architect said should be temporary, and then torn down. This proposal to rebuild the so-called Electric Building offers no solution to other more pressing problems such as relocation of the important Aerospace Museum. This project merely demands millions of taxpayer dollars for this proposed building. There are far more necessary uses for park dollars. It would be a sad waste of public funds.

WALTER AMES  
PHILIP L. GILDRED

WILLIAM T. STEPHENS  
A. J. SUTHERLAND

### PROPOSITION C

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

PROPOSITION C. CITY OF SAN DIEGO BALBOA PARK FORD BUILDING  
AERO-SPACE MUSEUM BOND PROPOSAL.

To improve, develop and expand the historical, educational, and recreational services of The City of San Diego shall the City incur a bonded indebtedness in the principal amount of One Million Six Hundred Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$1,670,000) to permit the modification, repair and rehabilitation of the Ford Building in Balboa Park for the purpose of relocating the Aero-Space Museum in said building?

YES

NO

This proposition requires a two-thirds vote.

### TAX RATE STATEMENT

The estimated tax rate necessary to finance the principal and interest of the proposed bond issue for the modification, repair and rehabilitation of Balboa Park Ford Building—Aero-Space Museum during the fiscal year 1973-74 is forty-five one-hundredths cents (\$0.0045) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City. It is also estimated that the highest tax rate required to finance the principal and interest of this bond issue will be seventy-two one-hundredths cents (\$0.0072) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City and that tax rate will occur in the fiscal year 1978-79.

W. G. SAGE  
City Auditor and Comptroller

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C**

One of San Diego's potentially great assets is going "down the drain" if those of us who are concerned don't lend our support by voting YES on Proposition C.

At long last there is an economical and practical plan for meaningful use of the spacious Ford Building as a permanent home for the Aero-Space Museum—a role for which it is ideally suited. For years this great structure has been reduced to a "white elephant" status as a storage warehouse.

Of all San Diego Balboa Park attractions, the second largest in attendance is the Aero-Space Museum. This world renowned historical aviation collection was acquired by gift or loan at no expense to taxpayers. Since 1965 the priceless Aero-Space Museum's rare and irreplaceable exhibits have been temporarily housed in the unsafe and inadequate "Electric" building of 1915.

The \$1.67 million expenditure for the Ford Building will assure San Diego having one of the world's truly great museums, displaying vintage aircraft, engines and spacecraft, and aerospace memorabilia, including an outstanding library and archives.

To meet code and safety requirements, and to preserve a part of San Diego's history — the 1935 California Pacific International Exposition—the Ford Building must be rehabilitated; but when completed, its value will be more than four times the amount of the investment. A magnificent overlook of the City, bay and bridge will then be an added attraction for citizen and visitor alike.

Your YES vote for the Aero-Space Museum to move to the rehabilitated Ford Building will give San Diegans a better Balboa Park, with long-lived public benefit.

COL. OWEN F. CLARKE

MRS. MARIAN E. BANKS

DR. FRANK M. LOWE

JOSEPH P. McDONOUGH

WALTER M. SCHIRRA, SR.

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C**

Vote No on this unnecessary tax burden. Cost of food, housing and medical expenses are so high now, that many people feel they cannot afford any more taxes. Some people on fixed or low incomes are forced to sell or lose their property because of high taxes. This type of bond has been defeated in the past for the very mentioned reasons, which are even more so today. Look at your tax bill. It is increasing because of new assessments on property, and inflationary spending such as this. Your rent and property taxes will likely go up even higher if this bond passes. As a resident, citizen and taxpayer, recommendation is to vote a strong No!

MARK D. HAFFEY, JR.

**PROPOSITION D**

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

PROPOSITION D. INITIATIVE MEASURE LIMITING THE HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE COASTAL ZONE IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.  Shall the people of the City of San Diego ordain that buildings to be built in the Coastal Zone shall be 30 feet or less in height? The Coastal Zone for this ordinance shall be that portion of the City west of Interstate 5, except the area bounded by National City on the south, San Diego Bay on the west and Laurel Street on the north.	YES	186,007 63,062
	NO	108,968 36,942

This proposition requires a majority vote.

**INITIATIVE MEASURE: AN ORDINANCE LIMITING THE HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE COASTAL ZONE**

BE IT ORDAINED, by the people of the City of San Diego, as follows:

Section 1. Notwithstanding any section to the contrary, no building or addition to a building shall be constructed with a height in excess of thirty feet within the Coastal Zone of the City of San Diego. The words Coastal Zone, as used within this Ordinance, shall mean that land and water area of the City of San Diego from the northern city limits south to the border of the Republic of Mexico, extending seaward to the outer limit of city jurisdiction and extending inland to the location of Interstate 5 on January 1, 1971. This limitation shall not apply to that land area of the Coastal Zone bounded by National City on the south, San Diego Bay on the west and Laurel Street or the south-westerly projection of Laurel Street on the north.

The base of measurement of the height shall be in accordance with the Uniform Building Code of 1970.

Notwithstanding any section to the contrary, there shall be no exception to the provisions of this Ordinance.

Section 2. This Ordinance shall become effective upon the thirtieth day after receiving a majority of votes of the electors of the City of San Diego at an election held in said city.

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION D**

This measure preserves the unique and beautiful character of the coastal zone of San Diego. We estimate that even with this height limit, future development in this area will nearly double by 1990. We believe this height limit is necessary to guide development.

For 10 years the Planning Department has tried but produced no adequate height control. Great public concern caused the Council to place all the area covered by this initiative under a temporary height limit pending the voters' decision. YOU will decide.

**Reasons:**

- Beaches in high-rise communities become inaccessible to the public due to lack of parking, fencing-off of private property and overcrowding (Miami Beach, Waikiki).
- High-rise buildings obstruct needed ocean breezes, sky and sunshine.
- We hold the right of the public to use and reach their beach property to be greater than the right of a select few to build structures of unlimited height.
- The claim "High taxes require high-rise" is false. High-rise and its promotion has been a principle CAUSE of higher taxes. Practically all of the buildings in the coastal zone are low and economically profitable.
- Keep taxes down. There is proof that added services (sewers, streets, water, etc.) cost more to the taxpayer than the revenue brought in by high-rise.
- In the future the people can amend or repeal this ordinance. The Council can place any such proposal on a subsequent ballot, without need for another initiative petition. (Municipal Code 27.2531)
- This ordinance does not apply to Federal, State or Port District land.
- Some claim "Well-planned high-rise is better than a 30-foot wall". Experience proves that solid walls of high-rise result without height limits.
- San Diego's coastal area is our prime natural resource. Your vote will decide if it is to be preserved for the future. Vote YES on D.

Voters Organized to Think Environment — V.O.T.E.

ALEX LEONDIS  
Chairman

BETTY JEAN BISH  
Assistant Chairman

### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

In the event of a major disaster — fire or earthquake — in which the Salk Institute were destroyed, it could not be rebuilt if Proposition D is passed.

Similarly, churches, hotels, commercial or educational buildings 30 feet in height or more could not be constructed or replaced if they were extensively damaged.

Incredible! Yet this would be the effect of this initiative. There is no exception and no amendment possible without another city wide vote.

The initiative — contrary to claims of its proponents — would allow, however, a solid wall of thirty foot high buildings along the Beaches. It would in fact encourage construction of three story apartments with unimaginative flat roofs on all valuable multifamily or commercial property.

A reasonable control of building heights has recently been approved by the Planning Commission. This amendment which properly controls building height and bulk by Floor Area Ratio and encourages parking within buildings is scheduled for final adoption by the City Council in early September.

The City Council's effort to encourage diversity of architecture, provide open-space between buildings, and preserve access to the beaches and parks would be thwarted.

Height limitation does not control density. Height limitation does not solve parking problems. Height limitation does not reduce crime, noise, air pollution or taxes.

On the contrary, height limitation tends to encourage those evils. It would foster an increase in the number of buildings using maximum site area. Underground parking would be discouraged; any land not used for building construction would likely be covered by asphalt or concrete. Excess cars would be parked on streets, increasing congestion and chances for assault and robbery.

If you not only want to preserve but enhance the environment which has made San Diego America's "Finest City" vote NO on Proposition D.

STUART R. SHAFFER  
Director  
San Diego Section  
American Institute of Planners

JOHN D. HENDERSON  
President  
San Diego Chapter  
American Institute of Architects

### PROPOSITION E

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

PROPOSITION E. CITY OF SAN DIEGO LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROPOSAL FOR ELDERLY LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS.	YES	
Shall the Housing Authority of The City of San Diego develop, construct and acquire in the City of San Diego, with Federal assistance, low rent housing specifically designed for elderly low-income residents, not to exceed a total of five hundred units, on scattered sites?	NO	

This proposition requires a majority vote.

### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is an opportunity for San Diegans to provide critically needed housing for elderly citizens of low income using NO LOCAL TAX DOLLARS.

The absence of low-income housing units for elderly citizens has reached critical proportions in San Diego. City studies and 1970 census data reveal:

1 out of 5 elderly San Diegans (some 15,982, 62 years or older) live in substandard housing despite this emergency housing shortage, there are fewer than 400 units now available for our senior citizens

there are currently 600 applicants on the waiting list for the leased housing program alone repeated attempts since January, 1970, to obtain 2000 leased housing units from the federal government have resulted in only 579 units

What this means in more human terms is:

thousands of elderly San Diegans live in houses that are not only inadequate, but unsafe many more are paying a disproportionate share of their income to obtain decent housing, leaving insufficient funds for food, medical expenses and other necessities

Something can and must be done, because all other local efforts to provide this needed housing have been inadequate.

Public housing is federally funded. No local tax dollars will be used. Our federal taxes are currently providing public housing in other cities. It makes little sense to pay for public housing in other cities, where it has proved most successful, while denying our own citizens the benefit of this program.

We urge your YES vote on Proposition E.

PETE WILSON  
Mayor

MARGUERITE E. SCHWARZMAN  
Senior Citizen — Housing Advocates

LOCH CRANE  
Chairman, Housing Advisory Board

LUCIA SMALHEER  
President, League of Women Voters  
of San Diego

#### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

In our opinion, we do not need public housing to accomplish our objective of housing the low-income elderly.

To help low-income families, elderly and others who require housing, we favor direct assistance through established agencies, adequate funding of existing programs for rent supplements, section 236 of FHA, the lease of existing privately owned housing for this purpose now being operated successfully by the City Housing Authority without removing this housing from the payment of taxes and the program for interest rate subsidies. These programs should be continued as substitutes for government-owned public housing.

These programs bring housing within the financial reach of families without removal from the tax rolls. Low rental subsidized, tax free, public housing has failed in its national objective to bring housing to the needy; it has been abandoned in some cities as unworkable. Public housing exemption from real estate taxation puts a greater burden on the rest of the people who must then pay higher taxes.

It has been stated by many experts that San Diego is over-built in apartment dwellings. Let us not compound the problem by building more apartments by the city, but rather lease more of the existing units to house low-income elderly.

Proponents of this measure have stated that 20,000 persons would be eligible for the proposed housing. It would be physically and financially impossible to accommodate 20,000 people in San

Diego in this manner. If we constructed only 500 units who would be the favored few? We urge a "NO" vote.

DONALD A. WIEDMANN  
President, San Diego  
Board of Realtors

DAVE SNYDER  
Member of San Diego Housing  
Advisory Board

### PROPOSITION F

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

PROPOSITION F. CITY OF SAN DIEGO OPEN SPACE BOND PROPOSITION.		
The people of San Diego voted last June to create the Environmental Growth Fund to provide the monies to acquire open space from gas and electric franchise fees paid the City. Shall the City incur a general obligation bonded indebtedness in the principal amount of Twenty-two Million Dollars (\$22,000,000) for the acquisition and improvement of open space for park and recreational purposes, pledging in payment of principal and interest thereon two-thirds of the Environmental Growth Fund created by Charter vote of the people for that purpose?	YES	
	NO	

This proposition requires a two-thirds vote.

### TAX RATE STATEMENT

Bonds to acquire open space in the City of San Diego will be issued in five annual amounts of four million four hundred thousand dollars (\$4,400,000) commencing with the fiscal year 1973-74.

The estimated tax rate necessary to finance the principal and interest of the proposed twenty-two million dollar (\$22,000,000) bond issue during the fiscal year 1974-75 is one and twelve one-hundredths cents (\$0.0112) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City. It is estimated that the highest tax rate required to finance the principal and interest of this bond issue will be five and four one-hundredths cents (\$0.0504) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) of the assessed valuation of the real and personal property within the City and that tax rate will occur in the fiscal year 1978-79.

The City Council must direct that the interest and principal payments be paid as they become due from revenues in the Special Environmental Growth Fund. It is anticipated that there will be sufficient revenue in this fund to meet the bond principal and interest payments and therefore no property tax for this purpose should be necessary.

W. G. SAGE  
City Auditor and Comptroller

### ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION F

Your YES vote on Proposition F is an investment in San Diego's dwindling open space that will NOT cost you an increase in your property tax. Why not?

Because in June the people of San Diego voted to set aside a portion of the fees paid the City



by San Diego Gas and Electric Company as a special fund to finance the acquisition of open space.

The voters approved earmarking some of this money (which you already pay indirectly as a consumer of gas and electricity) to pay the principal and interest on the bonds you are now being asked to approve.

In short, we are able to borrow now to buy open space, knowing we can pay back ALL we borrow with interest from the gas and electric fees we receive each year — WITH NO PROPERTY TAX INCREASE AS A RESULT.

Open space is needed to provide for the enjoyment and recreation possible from a Balboa Park — or from a natural park — and also to provide relief from the relentless urban sprawl that will otherwise beset San Diego.

Open space provides buffer zones which separate development and provides breathing room.

But the rising cost of land requires that we act now to preserve our open spaces.

Certainly the land will never be cheaper than it is today.

And if we wait, we could very probably lose the chance to acquire it at all.

The pressure on owners to develop it themselves — or sell it to developers — makes it virtually certain that much of these desperately needed open space lands will be lost forever if "F" fails.

The time to act is now.

"F" is for foresight, for the future, and to assure that San Diego remains America's Finest City — WITHOUT an increase in your property tax.

PETE WILSON  
Mayor

EBEN W. DOBSON, JR.  
President, San Diego Chamber of Commerce

GERALD FOX  
Vice Pres., Planning and Conservation League

(MRS. JACK D.) JANET E. BRITT  
Environmental Health Chairman  
9th District PTA

R. R. RICHARDSON  
Secretary-Treasurer  
San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council

### ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

#### TAXPAYERS VOTE NO ON THIS ILL-ADVISED BOND ISSUE!

We are being told that the 22 million dollar open space bond will cost us nothing, however according to the San Diego Union 7/19/72 City Mgr. Kimball Moore said, "the major source of matching funds will have to come from assessment districts". — what districts? yours or mine? All of this conflicting double talk makes this bond issue suspect. Alleged free funds for financing is misleading, there are none. Everything costs the taxpayers something — nothing is free.

All monies derived from Government comes from you the taxpayer, whether it be City, State or Federal funds. Monies diverted from other sources to pay for this open space, could be used to reduce the property tax rate or possibly just reduce the stadium indebtedness.

After careful research, our organization has discovered the following figures. According to our

City Auditor, as of June 30, 1972 we have a present bonded indebtedness of 54 million 73 thousand dollars in general obligation bonds. We have no desire to reach our maximum bonded indebtedness and place our city's credit in jeopardy. With this costly project will come more appointees, more assistants, more committees and departments! — and with the high cost of food, housing, and other necessities, this is not the time for this bond issue. INFLATIONARY SPENDING CAUSES HIGHER ASSESSMENTS AND TAX RATES ON REAL PROPERTY WHICH IN TURN INCREASES RENTS ON PROPERTY.

We urge you not to be deceived, and obligate your city to the year 2001. Let's stop this reckless spending that will have to be paid by the next generation. In the interest of Good Government, Taxpayers Concerned recommend a No vote on Proposition F.

TAXPAYERS CONCERNED

ROBERT REYBURN  
Council Observer

MILDRED RUPLINGER  
Treasurer

LILA BUCK  
Secretary

MARTIN J. MONTROY  
Public Relations Advisor

P. E. RUPLINGER  
Vice-President