

SAN DIEGO

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO PROPOSITIONS
TWO PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS,
TWO ORDINANCES FOR RATIFICATION
TOGETHER WITH ARGUMENTS.**

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

SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1978

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

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR
City Clerk

01946

11/7/78

PROPOSITION H

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

H PROPOSITION H. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. AMENDS SECTION 18 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Shall the Charter be amended to permit the publication of the title, number and digest of an ordinance or resolution of general interest rather than the full text thereof?	YES	
	NO	

This proposition amends the Charter of The City of San Diego by amending Section 18. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKEOUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

This proposition requires a majority vote.

Section 18. AUTHENTICATION AND PUBLICATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

Upon its final passage each ordinance or resolution shall be authenticated by the signatures of the Mayor and the City Clerk and shall be recorded in a book kept for that purpose. Within fifteen days after final passage the title and number of each ordinance or resolution of a general nature, together with a brief synopsis thereof prepared by the City Attorney, shall be published at least once in such manner as may be provided by this Charter or by ordinance. The publication shall be accompanied by the notice that the ordinance or resolution is available for perusal in the office of the City Clerk.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This proposition will allow the City to save up to \$15,000 of your tax dollars during the next year and even more in the future.

The City Charter presently requires that ordinances and resolutions of general interest be published in full following their adoption by the City Council. The City publishes these ordinances and resolutions in the San Diego Daily Transcript. Among the lengthy and expensive ordinances published are the City's budget ordinance and the salary ordinance which lists the wage rates for all City job classifications. The publication cost for the salary ordinance alone is over \$2,000.

The proposed change in the City Charter will allow the City to publish the title, number, and a digest of an ordinance or resolution and reduce publication costs by as much as 97%. Copies of all ordinances and resolutions will still be available to the public from the office of the City Clerk. This change will in no way hamper your access to information about City government.

Eliminate unneeded government costs by voting yes on Proposition H.

PETE WILSON
Mayor
City of San Diego

LARRY STIRLING
Councilmember, District 7

JAMES M. HARRIS
S.D. Taxpayers Association

RAY T. BLAIR, JR.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR

11/7/78

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Open government is a San Diego tradition.

We have open meetings of public officials, open public records, open disclosure of financial interests.

We urge your NO vote on Proposition H to keep City government "open" to your inspection.

Today when the City Council passes a new law, the ENTIRE law must be printed in the newspaper for all to see. If Proposition H passes, only a brief legalistic summary of new laws would be published.

Why is this requirement in the City Charter? It was put there in 1931, when our present Charter was adopted. San Diego was then emerging from years of scandal and corruption in City government. This Charter section is one more safeguard against backroom deals hidden from public view.

Let's continue the open San Diego style of City government.

Please vote NO on Proposition H.

PAMELA J. BUNN
San Diego Young Americans for Freedom

MABEL L. BUNN
San Diego Young Americans for Freedom

11/7/78

PROPOSITION J

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

J	PROPOSITION J. CITY OF SAN DIEGO CHARTER AMENDMENT. AMENDS SECTION 71 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Shall the Charter be amended to limit the amount of money that may be set aside for the general operations of the City?	YES	
		NO	

This proposition amends the Charter of The City of San Diego by amending Section 71. The portions to be deleted are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and the portions to be added are underlined.

This proposition requires a majority vote.

Section 71. PREPARATION AND PASSAGE OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

Upon receipt of the Manager's estimate the Council shall prepare an appropriation ordinance using such estimate as a basis. The form, arrangement and itemization of the appropriation ordinance shall be determined and prescribed by the Auditor and Comptroller, and City Attorney. Provision shall be made by the Council for a minimum of two (2) public hearings upon the appropriation ordinance either before a Committee of the Council or before the Council sitting as a committee of the whole. Following the public hearings, the appropriation ordinances shall take the same course in the Council as other ordinances and shall be adopted during the month of July. The Council may reduce or eliminate any item, may increase any amount or add any new item for personal services, contractual services, materials, supplies, and equipment for any Department. However, the appropriation for the general operations of the City excluding water utilities funds, capital improvements, bond interest and redemption, retirement system contributions, grant funded programs, all other special funds in existence prior to the effective date of this section and expenditures to pay judgments or extraordinary claims or to defray the cost of emergency measures as defined in Section 17 of this Charter shall not exceed the prior year's appropriation for general operations of the City, with the stated exclusions, adjusted by no more than three quarters (¾) of the percentage change in the price index added to any percentage increase in population growth. For purposes of this limitation, the term "percentage change in price index" shall be the percentage change from the first full quarter of the prior calendar year to the first full quarter of the current calendar year in the costs of goods and services purchased by local governments, as determined by the City Auditor and Comptroller from information published by United States Department of Commerce or other official government sources. The term "percentage increase in population growth" shall be any percentage increase from the first full quarter of the prior calendar year to the first full quarter of the current calendar year in the total population of the City as estimated by the Planning Director. This limitation shall not apply to any expenditure approved by a majority of the qualified electors of the City voting at a general

11/7/78

or special election subsequent to the effective date of this section. In the event that the revenues for the general operations of the City, with the stated exclusions, exceed the appropriation for such operations by more than 5%, such excess shall be used solely for tax reductions or tax refunds in a manner determined by the City Council. Upon final passage, the appropriation ordinance shall be published in the manner provided for the publication of other ordinances.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J sets a tight lid on how much of your tax dollars the City can spend. We propose this measure because no level of government should be allowed to continue to spend without explicit limits — something that Proposition 13 left undone. You, the taxpayers, live within limits: so should your city government. Proposition J is not only anti-spending, it is anti-inflationary. It says: "The bucks stop right here!"

This proposition is the latest in a series of fiscal innovations that have kept down the cost of government in the City of San Diego and prompted spending critic Howard Jarvis to remark that if all cities had been run as well as San Diego "we wouldn't have needed Proposition 13."

This plan affixes in the City Charter this city's voluntary expenditure limit in order to bind future city officials to the same prudent course. Proposition J does so with flexibility and without impairment to sound fiscal management.

Basically, Proposition J permits the city budget to only increase to allow for growth in population and to offset 3/4 of the increase in prices. This avoids any revenue windfalls to the city.

At the same time, Proposition J grants sensible exemptions for fluctuations in cost over which the City Council has absolutely no control. For instance, it permits growth in the budget when you, the voters, expressly approve a new city service or program.

That's accountability and that's the way it ought to be.

Proposition J offers a responsible measure of restraint at a time of need and guarantees it for the future. We cannot afford to let it slip away.

PETE WILSON
Mayor
City of San Diego

EDWIN J. GRAY
President
San Diego Taxpayers Association

J. BRUCE HENDERSON
President
Association of Concerned Taxpayers

LEE GRISSOM
Executive Vice-President
San Diego Chamber of Commerce

CLARENCE PENDLETON
President
San Diego Urban League

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

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

11/7/78

PROPOSITION K

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

K PROPOSITION K. RATIFICATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 12399 (NEW SERIES): Shall Ordinance No. 12399 (NEW SERIES) entitled, "AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR CONVEYANCE OF THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF PUEBLO LOTS 1317, 1318 AND 1351 OF THE PUEBLO LANDS OF SAN DIEGO, UPON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS MAY BE DEEMED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO," adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego be ratified?	YES	
	NO	

This proposition requires a majority vote.

ORDINANCE NO. 12399 (NEW SERIES) READS AS FOLLOWS:

ORDINANCE NO. 12399 (NEW SERIES)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR CONVEYANCE OF THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF PUEBLO LOTS 1317, 1318 and 1351 OF THE PUEBLO LANDS OF SAN DIEGO, UPON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS MAY BE DEEMED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

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

Section 1. The City of San Diego be, and it is hereby authorized and empowered to sell or convey all or any portion of the remaining unratified portions of Pueblo Lots 1317, 1318 and 1351 consisting of a total area of approximately 257 acres more or less. The aforementioned Pueblo Lots are located generally westerly and southerly of Interstate 805, easterly of Genesee Avenue and northerly of a line southerly of Eastgate Mall.

Section 2. All sales or conveyances of the above described Pueblo Lots shall be made upon such terms and conditions as may be deemed by the City Council to be in the best interests of the people of The City of San Diego.

Section 3. This ordinance requires ratification by the voters and being related to elections is of the kind and character authorized for passage on its introduction by Section 16 of the Charter.

Section 4. This ordinance shall become effective only after it is affirmatively approved by a majority vote of the qualified electors of The City of San Diego voting at a special municipal election to be held in said City on the 7th day of November, 1978, at which a proposition to ratify this ordinance shall be submitted.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney
By: ROBERT S. TEAZE, Assistant City Attorney

11/7/78

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on August 14, 1978, by the following vote:

YEAS: O'Connor, Lowery, Schnaubelt, Gade, Wilson.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mitchell, Williams, Stirling, Haro.

AUTHENTICATED BY:

PETE WILSON,
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR,
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

By: BETTY GOLDBERG, Deputy.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing ordinance was passed on the day of its introduction, to wit, on August 14, 1978, said ordinance being of the kind and character authorized for passage on its introduction by Section 16 of the Charter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the reading of said ordinance in full was dispensed with by a vote of not less than a majority of the members elected to the Council, and that there was available for the consideration of each member of the Council and the public prior to the day of its passage a written or printed copy of said ordinance.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR,
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

By: BETTY GOLDBERG, Deputy.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Propositions K and L permit the use of 400 acres of city-owned land for the purpose of allowing the construction of light manufacturing plants, research centers, company headquarters, and similar industrial park facilities.

The sale of these now unproductive tracts of land will generate revenue and broaden San Diego's economic base by being on the tax rolls. That means the entire community — you, the taxpayer — benefits because your overall tax burden will be reduced.

Of the most critical importance, well over 7,500 desperately needed jobs will be created in this community by the passage of Propositions K and L.

We must create new jobs for San Diegans or face the unacceptable alternative of ever-increasing welfare and unemployment, high taxes and social disruption.

The choice is clear. The only responsible course for both city officials and business leaders to take is to nurture the economic growth necessary to create the jobs for San Diegans.

San Diego has done an admirable job of attracting new industry. Some 1,500 new firms relocated in San Diego last year, but we are in jeopardy of not being able to sustain the pace. Industrial centers have depleted available space and increasingly businesses are forced to look for locations outside of the city.

Estimates are that currently only 39% of new industry is able to locate within the City of San Diego due to the lack of available industrially-zoned land.

Passage of Propositions K and L will assure the carefully measured expansion of our

11/7/78

economic base without impairment to the attractiveness of San Diego and our lifestyle.

We will be guaranteed a continued pattern of clean industry in park-like settings.

We are presented with the opportunity to maintain the quality of life so prized by residents, visitors and business alike. After all, a job certainly belongs in everyone's definition of a good quality of life.

PETE WILSON
Mayor
City of San Diego

GORDON LUCE
Chairman
Economic Development Corp. of San Diego

LEE GRISSOM
Executive Vice President
San Diego Chamber of Commerce

CLARENCE PENDLETON
President
San Diego Urban League

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K!

Selling city land is bad business. Present plans for redevelopment of only 25 acres of downtown requires the taxpayers to repurchase for **\$40,000,000** what the taxpayers sold to Alonzo Horton for **\$6.40** in 1867. Our city fathers could have leased the same land to Horton for seven cents a year for 100 years and still have saved us forty million dollars!

Ever since man began to walk the Earth, people have been tempted to sell out their means of future livelihood for today's uncertain promises. What will happen when our grandchildren no longer have "excess" lands to barter off for a quickie meal or some other equally illusory benefit? The land provides the basis for many meals for many years.

Fortunately, we can use the land today and still retain our options on future uses simply by leasing instead of selling.

Had we retained public ownership of the original pueblo lands, leasing to anyone who wanted to use on fair long-term leases, there would be no need for taxes to support municipal services today! Certainly there would be no need to expend hundreds of millions on urban renewal! Mission Bay is a model of what can be accomplished when leases are utilized and sales prohibited.

Leases promote good use of land — sales lead to land speculation.

Reject these short-sighted and politically motivated propositions which will invariably end up costing us many fold what we will gain today.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K!

PHILIP SHAFER
FLOYD MORROW

11/7/78

economic base without impairment to the attractiveness of San Diego and our lifestyle.

We will be guaranteed a continued pattern of clean industry in park-like settings.

We are presented with the opportunity to maintain the quality of life so prized by residents, visitors and business alike. After all, a job certainly belongs in everyone's definition of a good quality of life.

PETE WILSON
Mayor
City of San Diego

GORDON LUCE
Chairman
Economic Development Corp. of San Diego

LEE GRISSOM
Executive Vice President
San Diego Chamber of Commerce

CLARENCE PENDLETON
President
San Diego Urban League

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K!

Selling city land is bad business. Present plans for redevelopment of only 25 acres of downtown requires the taxpayers to repurchase for **\$40,000,000** what the taxpayers sold to Alonzo Horton for **\$6.40** in 1867. Our city fathers could have leased the same land to Horton for seven cents a year for 100 years and still have saved us forty million dollars!

Ever since man began to walk the Earth, people have been tempted to sell out their means of future livelihood for today's uncertain promises. What will happen when our grandchildren no longer have "excess" lands to barter off for a quickie meal or some other equally illusory benefit? The land provides the basis for many meals for many years.

Fortunately, we can use the land today and still retain our options on future uses simply by leasing instead of selling.

Had we retained public ownership of the original pueblo lands, leasing to anyone who wanted to use on fair long-term leases, there would be no need for taxes to support municipal services today! Certainly there would be no need to expend hundreds of millions on urban renewal! Mission Bay is a model of what can be accomplished when leases are utilized and sales prohibited.

Leases promote good use of land — sales lead to land speculation.

Reject these short-sighted and politically motivated propositions which will invariably end up costing us many fold what we will gain today.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K!

PHILIP SHAFER
FLOYD MORROW

19530

11/7/78

PROPOSITION L

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

L PROPOSITION L. RATIFICATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 12400 (NEW SERIES). Shall Ordinance No. 12400 (NEW SERIES) entitled, "AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR CONVEYANCE OF THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF PUEBLO LOTS 1353 AND 1355 OF THE PUEBLO LANDS OF SAN DIEGO, UPON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS MAY BE DEEMED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO," adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego be ratified?	YES	
	NO	

This proposition requires a majority vote.

ORDINANCE NO. 12400 (NEW SERIES) READS AS FOLLOWS:

ORDINANCE NO. 12400 (NEW SERIES)

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE SALE OR CONVEYANCE OF THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF PUEBLO LOTS 1353 AND 1355 OF THE PUEBLO LANDS OF SAN DIEGO, UPON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS MAY BE DEEMED BY THE CITY COUNCIL TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

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

Section 1. The City of San Diego be, and it is hereby authorized and empowered to sell or convey all or any portion of the remaining unratified portions of Pueblo Lots 1353 and 1355 consisting of a total area of approximately 143 acres more or less. The aforementioned Pueblo Lots are located generally northerly and easterly of Interstate 805 and southeasterly of a point just north of Sorrento Valley Boulevard.

Section 2. All sales or conveyances of the above described Pueblo Lots shall be made upon such terms and conditions as may be deemed by the City Council to be in the best interests of the people of The City of San Diego.

Section 3. This ordinance requires ratification by the voters and being related to elections is of the kind and character authorized for passage on its introduction by Section 16 of the Charter.

Section 4. This ordinance shall become effective only after it is affirmatively approved by a majority vote of the qualified electors of The City of San Diego voting at a special municipal election to be held in said City on the 7th day of November, 1978, at which a proposition to ratify this ordinance shall be submitted.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney
By: ROBERT S. TEAZE, Assistant City Attorney

11/7/78

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on August 14, 1978, by the following vote:

YEAS: O'Connor, Lowery, Schnaubelt, Gade, Wilson.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mitchell, Williams, Stirling, Haro.

AUTHENTICATED BY:

PETE WILSON,
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR,
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

By: BETTY GOLDBERG, Deputy.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing ordinance was passed on the day of its introduction, to wit, on August 14, 1978, said ordinance being of the kind and character authorized for passage on its introduction by Section 16 of the Charter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the reading of said ordinance in full was dispensed with by a vote of not less than a majority of the members elected to the Council, and that there was available for the consideration of each member of the Council and the public prior to the day of its passage a written or printed copy of said ordinance.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR,
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

By: BETTY GOLDBERG, Deputy.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Propositions K and L permit the use of 400 acres of city-owned land for the purpose of allowing the construction of light manufacturing plants, research centers, company headquarters, and similar industrial park facilities.

The sale of these now unproductive tracts of land will generate revenue and broaden San Diego's economic base by being on the tax rolls. That means the entire community — you, the taxpayer — benefits because your overall tax burden will be reduced.

Of the most critical importance, well over 7,500 desperately needed jobs will be created in this community by the passage of Propositions K and L.

We must create new jobs for San Diegans or face the unacceptable alternative of ever-increasing welfare and unemployment, high taxes and social disruption.

The choice is clear. The only responsible course for both city officials and business leaders to take is to nurture the economic growth necessary to create the jobs for San Diegans.

San Diego has done an admirable job of attracting new industry. Some 1,500 new firms relocated in San Diego last year, but we are in jeopardy of not being able to sustain the pace. Industrial centers have depleted available space and increasingly businesses are forced to look for locations outside of the city.

Estimates are that currently only 39% of new industry is able to locate within the City of San Diego due to the lack of available industrially-zoned land.

Passage of Propositions K and L will assure the carefully measured expansion of our economic base without impairment to the attractiveness of San Diego and our lifestyle.

We will be guaranteed a continued pattern of clean industry in park-like settings.

11/7/78

We are presented with the opportunity to maintain the quality of life so prized by residents, visitors and business alike. After all, a job certainly belongs in everyone's definition of a good quality of life.

PETE WILSON
Mayor
City of San Diego

GORDON LUCE
Chairman
Economic Development Corp. of San Diego

LEE GRISSOM
Executive Vice President
San Diego Chamber of Commerce

CLARENCE PENDLETON
President
San Diego Urban League

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION L!

Selling city land is bad business. It costs us money.

This prime 143 acres in Sorrento Valley along with the crucially located 257 acres adjacent to University Towne Centre (Proposition K) are too valuable to sell off. They will return many times as much money to us if leased, than they ever will from sales price and property taxes if sold.

Save this remaining heritage. Of the original 50,000 acres of Pueblo Land only about 800 acres are left to us.

Fortunately, we can use the land today and still retain our options on future uses simply by leasing instead of selling.

Had we retained public ownership of the original pueblo lands, leasing to anyone who wanted to use on fair long-term leases, there would be no need for taxes to support municipal services today! Certainly there would be no need to expend hundreds of millions on urban renewal! Mission Bay is a model of what can be accomplished when leases are utilized and sales prohibited.

Leases promote good use of land — sales lead to land speculation.

Reject these short-sighted and politically motivated propositions which will invariably end up costing us many fold what we will gain today.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION L!

PHILIP SHAFER
FLOYD MORROW