

County of San Diego



Sample Ballot & Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL ELECTION TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1996

VOTER ALERT!!!
YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED;
LOCATION IS SHOWN ON BACK COVER

- **POLLS OPEN AT 7 A.M. AND CLOSE AT 8 P.M.**
- **PLEASE CALL BEFORE ELECTION DAY IF DIRECTIONS ARE NEEDED**
- **TAKE THIS PAMPHLET WITH YOU TO THE POLLS**

For services available to voters with disabilities see last page.

Information pamphlet(s) concerning State Propositions will be mailed separately by the Secretary of State.

A Spanish language Voter Information Pamphlet is available upon request from the Office of the Registrar of Voters. (565-5800)

Existe un Folleto de Información en Español para el Padrón Electoral y está disponible en la Oficina de Registro del Padrón Electoral.

Solicítelo si le es necesario. (565-5800)

Compiled and Distributed by:

MIKEL HAAS, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite I, San Diego, CA 92123
Phone: (619) 565-5800



VOTE

SAMPLE

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 5, 1996 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

<p>PROP C AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Shall the City Charter be amended to create a branch library Endowment Fund and a Construction Fund with City's proceeds from a County-wide 1/4¢ sales tax, if the tax is approved? Amendment requires that Endowment Fund principal be invested and income be spent for neighborhood branch library books, capital improvements, youth programs, technology, extended hours, operations, and maintenance. Amendment requires City to maintain current funding level for library department.</p>	291	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	292	NO → <input type="radio"/>
<p>PROP D AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Rather than paying for health insurance benefits to retired City employees directly from the City's operating funds, as is the current practice, shall San Diego City Charter Section 141 be amended to authorize the City Council to provide these benefits through the San Diego City Retirement System?</p>	294	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	295	NO → <input type="radio"/>
<p>PROP E AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN. Shall the Official Phased Development Map of the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego be amended to change the designation of the 72 acres known as Seabreeze Farms from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing"?</p>	297	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	298	NO → <input type="radio"/>
<p>PROP F AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN. Shall the City of San Diego's General Plan be amended to redesignate 13 acres of property east of I-5 and adjoining El Camino Real within the 12,000-acre North City Future Urbanizing Area from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", on condition that an adjacent 14 acres be preserved as part of the Environmental Tier Wildlife Corridor in Gonzales Canyon and subject to City Council imposed restrictions, at a density not exceeding 80 detached single family dwellings?</p>	302	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	303	NO → <input type="radio"/>
<p>PROP G AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN. Shall the City of San Diego's General Plan be amended to redesignate 32.8 acres of property east of I-5 and adjoining Via de la Valle within the 12,000-acre North City Future Urbanizing Area from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", subject to certain conditions including construction of improvements to Via de la Valle and dedication of an adjacent 21 acres for wetland restoration, allowing mixed-use residential/commercial improvements having a floor area not exceeding 20% of the parcel area?</p>	307	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	308	NO → <input type="radio"/>
<p>PROP H AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN. Shall the Official Phased Development Map in the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego be amended to change the designation of the 1,134 acres known as Torrey Highlands from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", provided that the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan permanently preserves 250 acres of open space and a wildlife corridor connecting Penasquitos Canyon and Black Mountain Open Space Park?</p>	311	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	312	NO → <input type="radio"/>

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition C**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP C **AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.** Shall the City Charter be amended to create a branch library Endowment Fund and a Construction Fund with City's proceeds from a County-wide 1/4¢ sales tax, if the tax is approved? Amendment requires that Endowment Fund principal be invested and income be spent for neighborhood branch library books, capital improvements, youth programs, technology, extended hours, operations, and maintenance. Amendment requires City to maintain current funding level for library department.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The following section would be added to the San Diego City Charter:

SECTION 63. BRANCH LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION AND ENDOWMENT FUNDS

(a) (1) There is hereby created a Branch Library Endowment Fund. Into that fund shall be deposited the City's share of the proceeds of a five-year, one-quarter cent (1/4¢) sales tax increase approved by the electors at the November 1996 election, less the sum of sixty-five million dollars (\$65,000,000).

(a) (2) The sixty-five million dollars (\$65,000,000) shall be deposited into an interest-bearing Branch Library Construction Fund, which shall be used to build or improve branch libraries.

(a) (3) The tax proceeds shall be allocated to the Endowment and Construction Funds according to the following formula:

(a) (3) (A) One-third of all proceeds received by the City from the five-year, one-quarter cent (1/4¢) sales tax increase shall be allocated to the Construction Fund until a total of \$65 million has been deposited, exclusive of interest earnings. If this formula does not yield \$65,000,000 for the Construction Fund at the end of the final year the sales tax is collected, then an amount necessary to guarantee that the Construction Fund, less interest earned, reaches that goal shall be transferred from the Endowment Fund to the Construction Fund. Interest earned on the Construction Fund before it is spent shall accrue to the Construction Fund.

(a) (3) (B) Two-thirds of all proceeds received by the City from the five-year, one-quarter cent (1/4¢) sales tax increase, and any excess over the \$65,000,000 allocated to the Construction Fund, shall be allocated to the Endowment Fund.

(b) The principal of the Endowment Fund shall be invested and shall not be spent except as provided in Section 63(b). It is the intent that the Endowment Fund principal be invested with the primary goal of preserving its real value in relation to inflation, while providing a predictable amount available for expenditure for branch library purposes. Five percent (5%) of the value of the Endowment Fund principal calculated at the end of each calendar year shall be designated as available to be spent the following fiscal year for the purposes authorized under Section 63(c). However, upon the Funds Commission's recommendation and City Council's approval, the percentage designated as available to be spent may be changed if necessary to ensure that the value of the Endowment Fund keeps pace with inflation.

(c) The purpose of the Endowment Fund is to supplement, not supplant, existing funding for branch libraries. Subject to Section 63(e), the amount available to be spent each fiscal year shall be used solely and exclusively to pay for branch library books and materials, capital improvements, renovation, programs (including programs for children and youth), technology and services, extended hours, operations and maintenance. No more than one percent (1%) of the amount available to be spent annually may be used to pay for the City's costs related to administering the expenditure of the income from the Endowment Fund.

(d) Subject to the conditions set forth in Section 63(e), the Funds Commission shall have supervision and control over, and shall provide investment oversight for, the Endowment Fund. The Funds Commission shall ensure that there is an annual independent audit of the Endowment Fund.

(e) (1) In fiscal year 1998, five thousand dollars (\$5,000) shall be allocated from income earned on the Endowment Fund to each branch library and shall be placed in a discretionary fund. In fiscal year 1999 and each fiscal year thereafter, the City shall increase the discretionary fund allocation to each branch library from the previous fiscal year by a factor equal to the percentage growth in the U.S. Consumer Price Index from the preceding calendar year. The branch library discretionary funds are to be used for any branch library purpose that the City Librarian, or his or her designee, in consultation with City-recognized library support groups, deems appropriate. No branch library discretionary fund shall accumulate more than three (3) years' worth of allocations at any one time. The expenditure of income from the Endowment Fund for the purposes set forth in Section 63(e)(1) shall be the first priority for expenditures of income from the Endowment Fund.

(e) (2) The City's Board of Library Commissioners shall recommend to the City Manager and City Council how to spend the income from the Endowment Fund. The Board of Library Commissioners shall recommend expenditures to the City Manager and City Council for any branch library purposes authorized under Section 63(c), such that a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the available income from the Endowment Fund is spent annually.

(f) (1) For each fiscal year beginning in Fiscal Year 1998, in addition to moneys available to branch libraries from the Endowment Fund, the City Council shall maintain the entire library department's budget at the same percentage of total General Fund Revenues as was allocated in Fiscal Year 1997. In the event that branch libraries are expanded, added or closed during the fiscal year, each fiscal year's allocation shall be adjusted as necessary to reflect the expansion, increase or decrease in number of branch libraries. For any expanded, new or closed branch library facility, the amount of adjustment shall be calculated using staffing standards adopted by the City Council plus non-personnel expenses based on the average cost per square foot of operating the City's branch libraries.

(f) (2) The requirements of Section 63(f)(1) may be modified in any given fiscal year by six (6) affirmative votes of the City Council, provided that the City Council declares an official emergency and makes specific findings as to the need for the modifications.

(f) (3) Nothing in Section 63(f)(1) shall be interpreted to conflict with Section 11.1 of this Charter.

Notice to the Voter:

This measure will be void if the one-quarter cent (1/4¢) sales tax measure placed on the November 1996 ballot does not pass.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Create the **San Diego Neighborhood Branch Library Construction and Endowment Fund**.

Proposition C will:

Amend the City Charter to permit establishment of a **Community and Branch Library Construction and Endowment Fund**. The proceeds of this fund can be used only for neighborhood branch libraries.

- Establish the **Endowment Fund** to insure moneys earmarked for neighborhood libraries cannot be diverted for other uses.
- Establish **Construction Fund** to build or renovate run down neighborhood libraries.
- Insure that neighborhood libraries have a continuing source of funding over and above the existing city library budget.

Proposition C is **NOT**:

- It is NOT a tax.
- It is NOT for the downtown library. That project will be funded by other means. The **Endowment** is only for neighborhood branch libraries.

Why was Proposition C developed? Remember when the Symphony went bankrupt? Everyone said the Symphony needed an endowment – a fund that preserved its capital and generated interest to pay ongoing expenses – in perpetuity. Proposition C establishes the **San Diego Branch Library Endowment** to provide ongoing financing for neighborhood libraries.

Where will the money come from? Private donations will be solicited. In addition, if Proposition A passes, two-thirds of the city's share of new library money will go into the **San Diego Branch Library Endowment Fund**. The interest will help finance neighborhood libraries for years to come. The remaining third of Proposition A money will go for neighborhood library renovation and construction.

Why are we voting on this measure? The City Charter needs to be amended to permit establishment of a fund exclusively for neighborhood libraries. This is **NOT** a tax; it is a mechanism to establish the **Endowment**.

What a fabulous legacy for our children! Support Our Neighborhood Libraries.

Vote YES on Proposition C!
The San Diego Branch Library Endowment

THOMAS S. JAMIESON, President
Friends of the San Diego Public Library

DANIEL O. PEGG, President
San Diego Economic
Development Corporation

KATIE B. SULLIVAN, President
Citizens in Action for Local Libraries

GARRY COLLINS, President
San Diego Police Officers Association

EVELYN S. HERRMANN
Senior Citizen Advocate

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

SAN DIEGO TAXPAYERS BEWARE!

Join the San Diego County Taxpayers Association in opposing Proposition C.

This City Charter amendment tells the city how to spend \$183 million of the proposed county wide Proposition A, yet another regressive sales tax increase.

Proposition C calls for an unwarranted \$65 million city-wide branch library construction program. The city's **current**, highly successful branch library construction program builds and expands branches **without** a tax increase or a charter amendment.

Proposition C creates a \$118 million, sales tax funded endowment. Endowment distributions to the libraries would be about \$5.9 million a year. However, the city's present annual library budget would also have to be increased \$3.25 million a year due to the increased operating costs resulting from the construction of new branches. If these taxpayer-funded increases are implemented, the city library system total operating budget would skyrocket to \$28 million a year – a 48% increase.

These tax increases are unjustified. The San Diego City Manager's own survey found 93% of citizens satisfied with their present library service.

Proposition C – a tax-and-spend plan – did not originate with the library professional staff. Rather, it is the result of city politicians' efforts to popularize themselves with some voters by advocating huge, irresponsible sales tax spending on libraries.

The San Diego County Taxpayers Association opposes Proposition C.

Please vote "NO" on Prop C

ROBERT MAGNESS
Former City Library Commissioner
Former Vice-President of the Friends of the Library
Member of the 1988 County Library
Financial Planning Task Force

FRED SCHNAUBELT
Former San Diego City Councilman

RICHARD RIDER
Taxpayer Activist, Libertarian Party

JACK SANDERS
President
United Taxpayers of San Diego

BETSY MILL
Newsletter Editor

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition D**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP D AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Rather than paying for health insurance benefits to retired City employees directly from the City's operating funds, as is the current practice, shall San Diego City Charter Section 141 be amended to authorize the City Council to provide these benefits through the San Diego City Retirement System?

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

NEW LANGUAGE: UNDERLINED

SEC. 141. CITY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM. The Council of the City is hereby authorized and empowered by ordinance to establish a retirement system and to provide for death benefits for compensated public officers and employees, other than those policemen and firemen who were members of a pension system on June 30, 1946. No employee shall be retired before reaching the age of sixty-two years and before completing ten years of service for which payment has been made, except such employees may be given the option to retire at the age of fifty-five years after twenty years of service for which payment has been made with a proportionately reduced allowance. Policemen, firemen and full time lifeguards, however, who have had ten years of service for which payment has been made may be retired at the age of fifty-five years, except such policemen, firemen and full time lifeguards may be given the option to retire at the age of fifty years after twenty years of service for which payment has been made with a proportionately reduced allowance.

The Council may also in said ordinance provide:

(a) For the retirement with benefits of an employee who has become physically or mentally disabled by reason of bodily injuries received in or by reason of sickness caused by the discharge of duty or as a result thereof to such an extent as to render necessary retirement from active service.

(b) Death benefits for dependents of employees who are killed in the line of duty or who die as a result of injuries suffered in the performance of duty.

(c) Retirement with benefits of an employee who, after ten years of service for which payment has been made, has become disabled to the extent of not being capable of performing assigned duties, or who is separated from City service without fault or delinquency.

(d) For health insurance benefits for retired employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

SAVES TAX DOLLARS

The cost of providing health care benefits for employees in both the public and private sectors has skyrocketed in recent years. Proposition D would change the City Charter to permit shifting this costly item from the city's General Fund, paid by all taxpayers – to the city's retirement system, paid for by the retirement system's investment earnings and assets. This shift would save city taxpayers between **\$5 million** and **\$6 million** each year. That's why Proposition D is endorsed by the San Diego Taxpayers Association.

FAIRNESS FOR RETIRED POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS

Proposition D also brings health benefits for retired city workers – especially police and firefighters – into line with workers in comparably-sized cities. Our retired police and firefighters deserve fair and adequate retirement health benefits after putting their lives on the line for us throughout their careers. That's why Proposition D is endorsed by the San Diego Police Officers and Firefighters Associations.

PROTECTS RETIREMENT FUNDS

Most important, Proposition D protects the fiscal integrity of the city's retirement fund, using excess earnings to cover the full costs of workers retirement health benefits. That's why Proposition D is endorsed by members of the Retirement Board – elected by retired and active city workers – and by independent retirement system experts.

VOTE YES ON D

Save tax money, make sure our retired public safety officers get fair health benefits, and protect the city retirement fund by voting YES on Proposition D.

BARBARA WARDEN
San Diego City Councilmember

SCOTT BARNETT, Executive Director
San Diego County Taxpayers Association

GARRY COLLINS, President
San Diego Police Officers Association

RON SAATHOFF, President
San Diego Fire Fighters Association and
Trustee, City Employees Retirement System

STEVEN W. OXBERRY
Independent Fiscal Advisor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

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

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition E**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP E **AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN.** Shall the Official Phased Development Map of the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego be amended to change the designation of the 72 acres known as Seabreeze Farms from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing"?

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN**

In 1985, the voters of the City adopted the Managed Growth Initiative, known as "Proposition A," which amended the Guidelines for the Future Development Section of the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego by requiring approval of the voters before changing the designation of lands from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

The 72 acres known as Seabreeze Farms is currently designated as "Future Urbanizing" on the Official Phased Development Map in the City's Progress Guide and General Plan.

A plan to amend the Carmel Valley Community Plan and the Neighborhood 4/5/6 Precise Plan to include Seabreeze Farms within the Carmel Valley Community Plan was approved by the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board and was also adopted by the City Council.

Seabreeze Farms is located on the eastern boundary of the Carmel Valley Community Plan, on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. 750836, adopted by Resolution No. R-212692 of the City Council on Feb. 27, 1975, and is identified in Figure 1 in that Community Plan.

Seabreeze Farms is also included and identified in the Neighborhood 4/5/6 Precise Plan, on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-262226, adopted by Resolution No. R-262226 of the City Council on December 18, 1984.

Implementation of the amended Carmel Valley Community Plan and the Neighborhood 4/5/6 Precise Plan requires that the designation of Seabreeze Farms be changed from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

Approval of this change of designation in no way permits any other portion of the North City Future Urbanizing Area to have a change of designation without a separate vote of the people.

NOW, THEREFORE, the people of The City of San Diego do hereby amend the City's Progress Guide and General Plan by amending the Official Phased Development Map, on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-267565-1, to change the designation of the 72 acres known as Seabreeze Farms from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

It is a rare opportunity for community leaders to participate in designing one of their own neighborhoods from the ground up. Seabreeze Farms – an equestrian-oriented residential neighborhood – is just such an opportunity for San Diego and the people of Carmel Valley.

Seabreeze Farms, working with the Community Planning Board of Carmel Valley, has planned a new neighborhood which combines trails and preservation of open space with equestrian and residential uses. These Seabreeze community trails will connect into what will eventually become a regional system of trails that extend through Penasquitos Preserve to the south, through the San Dieguito River Valley regional open space park to the north and easterly through McGonigle Canyon all the way to Black Mountain Open Space Park.

Seabreeze Farms is a *model* for other communities to follow in designing new neighborhoods:

- It is consistent with the Managed Growth Initiative (Proposition A) approved by the voters in 1985.
- It has a broad base of support from environmental, civic and community interests.
- It brings benefits to existing neighbors while ensuring a high quality of life for those who locate in Seabreeze Farms.

If all residential neighborhoods were planned in cooperation with the community like Seabreeze Farms, San Diego would be an even better place to live.

Reasons why Seabreeze Farms (Proposition E) has *earned* the endorsement of the neighboring community planning board and other influential quality-of-life advocates:

1. Seabreeze Farms will retain the natural landform and landscaping.
2. Seabreeze Farms will start the ball rolling for creation of a regional multi-use trail system in the north city area.
3. Seabreeze Farms will provide a unique blend of permanently preserved open space in an equestrian and trail oriented neighborhood.
4. NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

SUPPORT COOPERATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING AND SAN DIEGO'S

QUALITY OF LIFE

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

JAN B. FUCHS, Chair
Carmel Valley Community Planning Board

THOMAS E. SCANLAN, President
San Diego County Trails Council

SCOTT BARNETT, Executive Director
San Diego County Taxpayers Association

THOMAS A. RITCHIE, President
Greater Del Mar Chamber of Commerce

HARRY MATHIS
San Diego City Councilmember

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

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

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition F**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP F **AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN.** Shall the City of San Diego's General Plan be amended to redesignate 13 acres of property east of I-5 and adjoining El Camino Real within the 12,000-acre North City Future Urbanizing Area from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", on condition that an adjacent 14 acres be preserved as part of the Environmental Tier Wildlife Corridor in Gonzales Canyon and subject to City Council imposed restrictions, at a density not exceeding 80 detached single family dwellings?

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN**

This Proposition amends the Progress Guide and General Plan ("General Plan") of the City of San Diego ("City") as follows:

A. In 1979 the City Council adopted a General Plan and that General Plan identified certain lands as urban reserve and designated those lands as "Future Urbanizing."

B. In 1985 the voters of the City adopted the Managed Growth Initiative - Proposition A - which required a vote of the people to change the designation of lands from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

C. On October 1, 1992, the City Council adopted a Framework Plan for a portion of the Future Urbanizing Area in the North City and designated such area as the North City Future Urbanizing Area.

D. The General Plan provides for the shift of land from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing" "as planned communities are built out or as opportunities to implement the balanced housing or land use goals of the City arise."

E. A 13-acre parcel of property within the North City Future Urbanizing Area (the "Property") (as described on the map on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. 00-18330), meets the criteria for shifting its designation from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

F. New jobs, increased economic activity, more housing opportunities which implement the goals of the General Plan, protection of sensitive resources and permanent protection of open space and recreational areas with the San Dieguito River Valley, and funding for the improvement of certain public facilities to, in part, alleviate traffic congestion are clearly of benefit to the City and its citizens.

G. To acquire these benefits at this time, it is necessary to change the designation of the Property from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

H. To ensure new development is sensitive to the environment, the voters wish to impose certain conditions on development of the Property.

I. The existing General Plan and zoning regulations permit up to three dwelling units on the Property.

J. This General Plan Amendment will permit the development of more than three dwelling units on the Property.

NOW, THEREFORE, the people of the City of San Diego do hereby amend the General Plan as follows:

Section 1. Change in Designation. The 13-acre Property described on the map on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. 00-18330, which is within the North City Future Urbanizing

Area, is hereby changed in designation from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing," and the Official Phased Development Map, on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-267565-1, is hereby amended to change the designation of the Property from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing." The change in designation approved by this General Plan Amendment shall be subject to the conditions set forth in Sections 2 through 10 of this General Plan Amendment unless any of those Sections are severed pursuant to Section 9.

Section 2. Mandatory Environmental Review. Environmental review, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, must be completed before the Property may be developed.

Section 3. Wildlife Corridor. Before Development proceeds on the Property, approximately 14 acres immediately adjacent to the Property shall be set aside by dedication, easement, transfer or other appropriate means for preservation as part of the Environmental Tier Wildlife Corridor, or as part of the proposed Multiple Species Conservation Program.

Section 4. Public Improvements. Fees collected for development of the Property shall go towards the Property's fair share of improvements of Via de la Valle, El Camino Real, park, library, fire, police and other public facilities.

Section 5. Density and Development Controls. Existing zoning would allow up to three dwelling units on the Property. This General Plan Amendment will permit development of more than three dwelling units in accordance with plans approved and development controls imposed by the San Diego City Council. Residential development will be allowed at a density of not more than 80 detached single family residential units.

Section 6. Definitions. For purposes of this General Plan Amendment, the following words and phrases shall have the following meaning:

- a. "City" means the City of San Diego.
- b. "Conditional Approval" means approval by the San Diego City Council subject to a vote of the electorate pursuant to Proposition A of 1985.
- c. "Framework Plan" means that document entitled "Framework Plan for the North City Future Urbanizing Area" adopted by the City Council on October 1, 1992, as amended on October 26, 1993.
- d. "North City Future Urbanizing Area" means that land area officially classified as being within the North City Future Urbanizing Area on October 1, 1992, the date of the adoption of the Framework Plan.
- e. "General Plan" means the Progress Guide and General Plan of the City of San Diego.
- f. "Development" means the issuance of building permits for the construction of residential dwellings or other structures.

Section 7. Framework Plan. Nothing in this General Plan Amendment is intended to be an initiative or referendum enacting or ratifying the Framework Plan.

Section 8. Compliance with the California Coastal Act. The City Council may modify any provision of this General Plan Amendment to comply with the requirements of the California Coastal Commission, provided such requirements do not increase the allowed density for the Property as set forth in this General Plan Amendment.

Section 9. Severability. If any provision of this General Plan Amendment, other than Section 1, is declared legally invalid or unenforceable, the balance of the provisions shall remain in full force and effect. If Section 1 is declared invalid, the entire General Plan Amendment is void and of no force and effect.

Section 10. Effectiveness. This General Plan Amendment shall be of no force or effect unless, prior to November 5, 1996, the City Council has Conditionally Approved development applications for the Property consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in this General Plan Amendment.

Section 11. Implementation. The City is authorized to amend, modify, or clarify City regulations, including but not limited to, the General Plan, the Municipal Code and the City Council Policies to implement the purpose and intent of this General Plan Amendment.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Today, when developing projects, property owners must demonstrate that they are good neighbors by making significant infrastructure improvements in their project areas and, when possible, by dedicating property for permanent open space.

- That is why **the San Diego City Council included these conditions in their Settlement Agreement** with the property owners and **voted unanimously to place this matter on the ballot for your approval.**
- **A YES vote on Proposition "F" will require the owners of this property to be good neighbors.**

Over the past several years the **City of San Diego**, many surrounding cities and the **San Diego Association of Governments** have been working with the **State Department of Fish and Game** and the **Federal Fish and Wildlife Service** to **create a contiguous corridor of habitat land for the protection of endangered species.**

- This **Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP)** only works if funding sources are identified to purchase land within the boundaries of the MSCP corridor, or **if property owners voluntarily dedicate land within the corridor.**
- We all know that funding sources for purchase of habitat land are scarce and very competitive. The most expeditious way to create these preserve corridors, **without taxpayers' expense, is to have property owners dedicate the land.**
- Approval of Proposition "F" **will require the property owners to dedicate 14 acres of their 27-acre parcel (52%), known as The Villas, to the Environmental Tier Wildlife Corridor in Gonzales Canyon.**

**Please support these planned urbanizing conditions by voting
YES on Proposition "F".**

ROY COLLINS
San Dieguito Partnership

R. MITCHEL BEAUCHAMP
Pacific Southwest Biological Services

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

VOTE "NO" ON HIGH DENSITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY

The project proposed in Proposition F:

- will destroy the openness and natural character of the San Dieguito River Valley and River Valley Park
- was proposed WITHOUT community planning and involvement

Reject High Density Development That Bypassed Community Planning And Conflicts With The Regional Park

- High density residential development on small lots IN the San Dieguito River Valley will destroy the open character of San Diego's last natural river valley.
- Proposition F proposes more than three times the homes in the City's General Plan and more than ten times the houses allowable under existing zoning.
- The project conflicts with goals and plans for the 55-mile "coast-to-crest" San Dieguito River Park. It would SEVERELY DEGRADE the regional park's visual qualities and natural, open space character.
- The project threatens the Gonzales Canyon wildlife corridor because of inadequate buffering and overly-dense housing development.
- This proposal is NOT part of an area plan. Voters rejected this kind of piecemeal development when they passed Proposition A, the Managed Growth Initiative.
- This proposal bypassed community planning which is UNFAIR to other developers who plan with the community before going to the voters. The Carmel Valley Planning Board, the official community planning group adjacent to the River Valley, recommended denial of this project.
- Proposition F is on the ballot as a result of the land owners filing numerous lawsuits against the City.

BY REJECTING PROPOSITION F, SAN DIEGO VOTERS CLEAR THE LEGAL DECKS, SO REAL PLANNING CAN PROCEED

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS F & G - THEY'RE WRONG
FOR THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK
AND FOR SAN DIEGANS WHO SUPPORT GOOD PLANNING

KATHLEEN McINTOSH, President
San Diego League of Women Voters

LYNN BENN, Former Member
San Diego City Planning Commission

LORI SALDANA, Chair
San Diego & Imperial Counties Chapter,
Sierra Club

DAVID KREITZER, Former Chair
San Diegans for Managed Growth

LORRAINE ROUSE, Director
Friends of San Dieguito River Park

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition G**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP G **AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN.** Shall the City of San Diego's General Plan be amended to redesignate 32.8 acres of property east of I-5 and adjoining Via de la Valle within the 12,000-acre North City Future Urbanizing Area from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", subject to certain conditions including construction of improvements to Via de la Valle and dedication of an adjacent 21 acres for wetland restoration, allowing mixed-use residential/commercial improvements having a floor area not exceeding 20% of the parcel area?

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN**

This Proposition amends the Progress Guide and General Plan ("General Plan") of the City of San Diego ("City") as follows:

- A. In 1979 the City Council adopted a General Plan and that General Plan identified certain lands as urban reserve and designated those lands as "Future Urbanizing."
- B. In 1985 the voters of the City adopted the Managed Growth Initiative - Proposition A - which required a vote of the people to change the designation of lands from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."
- C. On October 1, 1992, the City Council adopted a Framework Plan for a portion of the Future Urbanizing Area in the North City and designated such area as the North City Future Urbanizing Area.
- D. The General Plan provides for the shift of land from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing" "as planned communities are built out or as opportunities to implement the balanced housing or land use goals of the City arise."
- E. A 32.8-acre parcel of property within the North City Future Urbanizing Area (the "Property") (as described on the map on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. 00-18331), meets the criteria for shifting its designation from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."
- F. New jobs, increased economic activity, protection of sensitive resources and permanent protection of additional open space and recreational areas within the San Dieguito River Valley, and funding for the improvement of Via de la Valle to alleviate traffic congestion are clearly of benefit to the City and its citizens.
- G. To acquire these benefits at this time, it is necessary to change the designation of the Property from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."
- H. To ensure new development is sensitive to the environment, the voters wish to impose certain conditions on development of the Property.
- I. The existing General Plan and zoning regulations permit up to eight dwelling units on the Property.
- J. This General Plan Amendment will permit commercial development at not more than a .20 Floor Area Ratio on the Property, development which is not currently permitted without a vote of the electorate.

NOW, THEREFORE, the people of the City of San Diego do hereby amend the General Plan as follows:

Section 1. Change in Designation. The 32.8-acre Property described on the map on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. 00-18331, which is within the North City Future

Urbanizing Area, is hereby changed in designation from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing," and the Official Phased Development Areas Map, on file in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-267565-1, is hereby amended to change the designation of the Property from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing." The change in designation approved by this General Plan Amendment shall be subject to the conditions set forth in Sections 2 through 10 of this General Plan Amendment unless any of those Sections are severed pursuant to Section 9.

Section 2. Mandatory Environmental Review. Environmental review, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, must be completed before the Property may be developed.

Section 3. Wetland Restoration. Before Development proceeds on the Property, approximately 21 acres immediately adjacent to the Property shall be set aside by dedication, easement, transfer or other appropriate means to further the preservation and restoration of wetlands in the lower San Dieguito River Valley.

Section 4. Public Improvements. Fees collected for development of the Property shall go towards the Property's fair share of improvements to Via de la Valle, El Camino Real, park, library, fire, police and other public facilities.

Section 5. Density and Development Controls. This General Plan Amendment will permit commercial development of the Property in accordance with plans approved and development controls imposed by the San Diego City Council. Commercial development will be allowed at not more than a .20 Floor Area Ratio ("FAR"), calculated on the basis of the 32.8-acre parcel receiving the change in land use designation. Mixed use residential development, consistent with the CA-RR zone, may be allowed in the future but only within or as part of the .20 FAR development.

Section 6. Definitions. For purposes of this General Plan Amendment, the following words and phrases shall have the following meaning:

- a. "City" means the City of San Diego.
- b. "Conditional Approval" means approval by the San Diego City Council subject to a vote of the electorate pursuant to Proposition A of 1985.
- c. "Framework Plan" means that document entitled "Framework Plan for the North City Future Urbanizing Area" adopted by the City Council on October 1, 1992, as amended on October 26, 1993.
- d. "North City Future Urbanizing Area" means that land area officially classified as being within the North City Future Urbanizing Area on October 1, 1992, the date of the adoption of the Framework Plan.
- e. "General Plan" means the Progress Guide and General Plan of the City of San Diego.
- f. "Development" means the issuance of building permits for the construction of commercial structures, residential dwellings or other structures.

Section 7. Framework Plan. Nothing in this General Plan Amendment is intended to be an initiative or referendum enacting or ratifying the Framework Plan.

Section 8. Compliance with the California Coastal Act. The City Council may modify any provision of this General Plan Amendment to comply with the requirements of the California Coastal Commission, provided such requirements do not increase the allowed density for the Property as set forth in this General Plan Amendment.

Section 9. Severability. If any provision of this General Plan Amendment, other than Section 1, is declared legally invalid or unenforceable, the balance of the provisions shall remain in full force and effect. If Section 1 is declared invalid, the entire General Plan Amendment is void and of no force and effect.

Section 10. Effectiveness. This General Plan Amendment shall be of no force or effect unless, prior to November 5, 1996, the City Council has Conditionally Approved development applications for the Property consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in this General Plan Amendment.

Section 11. Implementation. The City is authorized to amend, modify, or clarify City regulations, including but not limited to, the General Plan, the Municipal Code and the City Council Policies to implement the purpose and intent of this General Plan Amendment.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The San Dieguito River Valley is a priority area for wetland restoration. And, Via de la Valle is a major thoroughfare in need of significant improvements to better handle traffic circulation in the area.

A YES vote on Proposition "G" **will require the owners of this property** to dedicate permanent open space for wetland restoration and to make significant improvements to Via de la Valle **as conditions** of receiving a "planned urbanizing" designation in the city's general plan.

- That is why the **San Diego City Council included these conditions in their Settlement Agreement** with the property owners and **voted unanimously to place this matter on the ballot for your approval.**

We all know that it is **extremely difficult and very expensive to extract environmental open space dedications.** And, with recent court rulings regarding assessment districts and requirements for 2/3 voter approval, **financing options for road improvements are becoming more and more difficult.**

Both problems **require significant contributions from property owners** as development occurs if we are to make any progress in our lifetimes.

- Proposition "G" **will require the owners of this property** to make significant improvements on Via de la Valle **at their expense and not the taxpayers'.**
- Proposition "G" **will require the owners of this property to dedicate over 21 of their 54 acres (39%) for restoration of sensitive wetlands.**
- This measure advances plans for habitat preservation and wetland restoration **desired by the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority.**

**Please support these planned urbanizing conditions by voting
YES on Proposition "G".**

ROY COLLINS
San Dieguito Partnership

R. MITCHEL BEAUCHAMP
Pacific Southwest Biological Services

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G
VOTE "NO" ON MASSIVE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT
IN THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY

The development proposed in Proposition G:

- will destroy the openness and natural character of the San Dieguito River Valley and River Valley Park
- was proposed WITHOUT community planning and involvement

Reject Massive Commercial Development
That Bypassed Community Planning And
Conflicts With The Regional Park

- 272,000 square feet of unspecified commercial development IN the San Dieguito River Valley will destroy the open character of San Diego's last natural river valley.
- This massive commercial development could include a 20-plex theater, auto showrooms, or an office complex, plus acres of parking - immediately adjacent to the regional park and conflicting with the City's General Plan.
- The project conflicts with goals and plans for the San Dieguito River Park which identify this area as the "western gateway" for the 55-mile "coast-to-crest" regional park.
- The project would intrude into wetlands and fails to meet the wetlands buffering provisions of City ordinance.
- This proposal is NOT part of an area plan. Voters rejected this kind of piecemeal development when they passed Proposition A, the Managed Growth Initiative.
- This proposal bypassed community planning which is UNFAIR to other developers who plan with the community before going to the voters. The Carmel Valley Planning Board, the official community planning group adjacent to the River Valley, recommended denial of this project.
- Proposition G is on the ballot as a result of the land owners filing numerous lawsuits against the City.

BY REJECTING PROPOSITION G, SAN DIEGO VOTERS CLEAR THE LEGAL
DECKS, SO REAL PLANNING CAN PROCEED

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS G & F - THEY'RE WRONG
FOR THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER PARK and
FOR SAN DIEGANS WHO SUPPORT GOOD PLANNING

KATHLEEN McINTOSH, President
San Diego League of Women Voters

LYNN BENN, Former Member
San Diego City Planning Commission

LORI SALDANA, Chair
San Diego & Imperial Counties Chapter,
Sierra Club

DAVID KREITZER, Former Chair
San Diegans for Managed Growth

LORRAINE ROUSE, Director
Friends of San Dieguito River Park

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition H**

(This proposition will appear on the ballot in the following form.)

PROP H **AMENDS THE SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN.** Shall the Official Phased Development Map in the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego be amended to change the designation of the 1,134 acres known as Torrey Highlands from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing", provided that the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan permanently preserves 250 acres of open space and a wildlife corridor connecting Pecos Canyon and Black Mountain Open Space Park?

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
SAN DIEGO PROGRESS GUIDE AND GENERAL PLAN**

In 1985, the voters of the City adopted the Managed Growth Initiative, known as "Proposition A," which amended the Guidelines for the Future Development Section of the Progress Guide and General Plan of the City of San Diego by requiring approval of the voters before changing the designation of lands from the "Future Urbanizing" designation.

A 1,134-acre property known as "Torrey Highlands" is located in Subarea IV of the North City Future Urbanizing Area and is currently designated as "Future Urbanizing" on the Official Phased Development Map in the City's Progress Guide and General Plan.

The Subarea IV Plan, which includes that 1,134 acres, was prepared and is entitled the "Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan."

The Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan provides that at least 250 acres of open space and a wildlife corridor connecting Pecos Canyon and Black Mountain Open Space Park are permanently preserved; and

The Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan was approved by the Community Planning Board of the neighboring community of Rancho Pecos and was adopted by the San Diego City Council.

Torrey Highlands is located on the western boundary of Rancho Pecos and is identified in Figure 1-2 in the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-287749, adopted by Resolution No. R-287749 of the City Council on August 5, 1996.

Implementation of the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan requires that the designation of Torrey Highlands be changed from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing."

Implementation of the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan requires the Poway Unified School District to concur with school siting, phasing and financing provisions set forth in the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan in order to fully compensate the school district for impacts the development may have on schools.

Approval of this change of designation in no way permits any other portion of the North City Future Urbanizing Area to have a change of designation without a separate vote of the people.

NOW, THEREFORE, the People of The City of San Diego do hereby amend the City's Progress Guide and General Plan, specifically by amending the Official Phased Development Map, on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR- 267565-1, to change the designation of 1,134-acres known as "Torrey Highlands" from "Future Urbanizing" to "Planned Urbanizing," provided that the City Council does not amend the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan to preserve any less than 250 acres of open space or reduce or eliminate the wildlife corridor which connects Pecos Canyon and Black Mountain Open Space Park.

The People of the City of San Diego hereby further ordain that the City shall not approve any application for the rezoning of property or approve any permit applications to increase density entitlements for those properties within the area identified in Figure 1-2 in the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan unless and until the Owner/Applicant of such land executes a School Facilities Funding and Mitigation Agreement, which is substantially similar in form and substance to the form of agreement set forth in Appendix A of the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan.

The People of The City of San Diego further ordain that the City shall not approve any application for the rezoning of property or approve any permit applications to increase density entitlements for those properties designated as school sites in the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan, unless the Poway Unified School District Board determines that such school site is no longer needed.

The People of the City of San Diego further ordain that the City shall not approve any application for the rezoning of property or approve any permit application to increase density entitlements for those properties within the area identified in Figure 1-2 in the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan unless or until the City has adopted a public facilities financing plan that requires the applicant to pay a fair share of the cost of necessary public facilities.

The People of the City of San Diego further ordain that the maximum number of residential dwelling units which may be permitted within the area identified in Figure 1-2 of the Torrey Highlands Subarea IV Plan shall not exceed the total number of units for the subarea as set forth in paragraph 4.5 of the Torrey Highlands Subarea Plan as of August 5, 1996.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

San Diego voters have consistently supported rigorous planning measures to preserve our quality of life and protect our environment. This Proposition guarantees the implementation of strict planning standards, created by the people of San Diego, which include the following elements:

- A completed and City-approved Subarea (community) plan
- Permanent open space and habitat conservation guarantees
- Guaranteed provision for a full range of housing types
- Fully funded school facilities to serve the student population created by the community
- Critically-needed street and highway improvements

By approving this Proposition, voters will do their part to ensure that planning of this area is consistent with requirements of the Managed Growth initiative (Proposition A) approved by voters in 1985.

Under the provisions of Proposition H, Torrey Highlands landowners must permanently preserve at least 250 acres of open space which will serve as a vital wildlife corridor connecting Penasquitos Canyon, Black Mountain Open Space Park and the San Dieguito River Valley "coast to crest" park. Proposition H also provides the area with a new high school, middle and elementary school, more than 8 miles of interconnected trails, two new neighborhood parks and a wildlife conservation center – all at no cost to taxpayers.

REASONS ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS, NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES, BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADERS SUPPORT PROPOSITION H:

Planners for Torrey Highlands have worked closely with environmental organizations, neighboring communities and business leaders to design a community that benefits all San Diego, through:

- Permanent preservation of sensitive open space
- Wildlife habitat protection
- New schools, parks, public facilities and contributions towards the completion of Highway 56
- Community planning which encourages a balance of new employment opportunities close to residential neighborhoods
- NO COST TO TAXPAYERS

SUPPORT PROPER PLANNING AND SAN DIEGO'S QUALITY OF LIFE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

KATHLEEN McINTOSH, President
League of Women Voters of San Diego

LORI SALDANA, Chapter Chair
San Diego-Imperial Counties Sierra Club

SCOTT BARNETT, Executive Director
San Diego Taxpayers Association

COREY S. BUCKNER, President
Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board

SUSAN GOLDING
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Here are the facts:

The development proposed by Proposition H

- Will allow more than 2,000 homes in the Future Urbanizing Area between I-5 and I-15.
- Will increase traffic at the I-5/805 merge
- Will increase traffic along I-15
- Will increase traffic in Carmel Valley, Rancho Penasquitos, Rancho Bernardo

The development proposed by Proposition H

- Does not have a financing plan for roads, public facilities, parks, and other public facilities
- Does not have a plan to finance police and fire services
- Does not have a plan for schools

Do you think it is time to open the Future Urbanizing area to a **2,000 plus housing development?**

Do you think it is time to add **more traffic to I-5 and I-15?**

Do you think it is time to let developers have voter approval without having a plan on **how the public facilities will be paid for?**

If your answer is **NO to more traffic, NO to a 2,000-plus housing development by opening the Future Urbanizing area, and NO to voter approval without financing plans**, then **VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION H!**

If they don't have a plan to finance police and fire services – guess who pays? **YOU DO.** The rest of the City pays!

Some of the people supporting Proposition H are good people. They mean well. But they also have an interest. They want open space in this area and they have cut a deal for it. It's that simple. But there is more to development than **free** open space. There are costs – including police and fire services – that must be accounted for **BEFORE** development is approved.

Please **VOTE NO** on Proposition H.

JERRY MAILHOT, Chair
Carmel Valley Coalition