



County of San Diego GENERAL ELECTION TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1992

SAMPLE BALLOT AND VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

- POLLS OPEN AT 7 A.M. AND CLOSE AT 8 P.M.
- POLLING PLACE IS SHOWN ON THE BACK COVER
- PLEASE CALL BEFORE ELECTION DAY IF DIRECTIONS ARE NEEDED
- TAKE THIS PAMPHLET WITH YOU TO THE POLLS

Information concerning the State Propositions will be mailed by the Secretary of State in a separate pamphlet.

Due to the census and adjustment of the number of people within each district, you may be required to:
1) vote in a different district; 2) go to a new polling place.

A Spanish Voter Information Pamphlet is available upon request from the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

Existe un Panfleto de Información en Español para el Padrón Electoral y está disponible en la Oficina de Registro del Padrón Electoral. Solicítelo, si le es necesario.

Compiled and Distributed by:
CONNY B. McCORMACK, REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
Phone: (619) 565-5800



MAIL BALLOT APPLICATION

DO NOT USE THIS FORM IF YOU HAVE ALREADY REQUESTED A MAIL BALLOT FOR THIS ELECTION.

URGENT. MAIL APPLICATION TODAY.
APPLICATION RECEIPT DEADLINE: OCTOBER 27, 1992

I choose the option of voting by mail instead of going to my polling place. I hereby request a mail ballot for the General Election on Tuesday, November 3, 1992.
(Voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Mail Ballot Voters. Please see last page of this sample ballot pamphlet for details.)

Date _____ Phone _____ Birth Date _____

Signature **X**
Applicant must sign his/her own signature. DO NOT PRINT

Address _____
Registered residence address in San Diego County, not a P.O. Box

PLEASE MAIL BALLOT TO ME AT:

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____


DETACH HERE

MAIL OR DELIVER APPLICATION TO:
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
5201 Ruffin Rd., Suite 1
P.O. Box 85520
San Diego, CA 92186-5520

DO NOT FORWARD

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
PLEASE TAKE THIS PAMPHLET WITH YOU TO THE POLLS

DO NOT REMOVE THIS LABEL



CHAPEL OF HAPPINESS HALL
3060 BROADWAY

30740000 - 7666293 - T610019

YES



CAR-RT PRESORT ** CR03

0272 LEON L. WILLIAMS
307400 3024 E ST
SAN DIEGO, CA


92102

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Diego, CA
Permit No. 4

VOTING BY MAIL


STEPS 2 & 3

Vote for One	
VINCENT VOTER	1 →
BETTY BALLOT	2 →
ELLEN ELECTION	3 →
134 measure number	
YES 236 → NO 237 →	
(TEXT)	




Use attached Pin to punch Ballot.
DO NOT use pen or pencil

Place
First Class
Postage
Stamp Here




STEP 6


Ballot Stub →




Fold-Over
Secrecy
Portion →



Ballot Card →



STEP 5



REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
P.O. BOX 85520
SAN DIEGO, CA 92186-5520

RETURN ADDRESS



Ans-0398 004.013.000

INSTRUCTIONS - VOTING BY MAIL

(Application is on back cover)

- STEP 1. Place the BALLOT CARD over the styrene pad, on a hard, flat surface.
- STEP 2. Use your sample ballot as a guide. Note the voting position number to the right of the candidate, or measure (yes or no), of your choice.
- STEP 3. Place punch pin firmly on black dot above the number on the ballot card that corresponds to the voting position number you have selected in your sample ballot. Punch through the dot into the styrene pad. Distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
- STEP 4. Remove any punchouts still hanging on the back of the ballot card.
- STEP 5. To vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is **not listed** on the ballot, write the office name and the candidate name in blank space provided on fold-over portion of the ballot card.
- STEP 6. After voting, detach small numbered stub at the top perforation. Keep as your receipt.
- STEP 7. Fold ballot card at the center perforation and insert ballot card and styrene pad inside the Return/Identification Envelope. **DO NOT RETURN PUNCH PIN** (It will damage Post Office equipment).
- STEP 8. SIGN YOUR NAME AND RESIDENCE ADDRESS (not P.O. Box) on flap of the envelope. (California Elections Code requirement). The Return/Identification Envelope **MUST BE SIGNED BY THE VOTER**. If you are unable to write, make your mark and have it witnessed by two persons. Signature with power of attorney is not acceptable. Your signature on the envelope is compared to the signature on your affidavit of registration. Ballots are later removed from envelopes without reference to voter identification, ensuring ballot secrecy. **FAILURE TO SIGN RETURN/IDENTIFICATION ENVELOPE WILL INVALIDATE YOUR BALLOT.**
- STEP 9. Return your **VOTED OFFICIAL BALLOT** by mail or in person to Registrar of Voters Office, or to any polls in San Diego County on Election Day.
- Note: If you are ill or disabled, you may authorize a close relative to return your ballot. Authorization block must be completed in order for the ballot to be counted.
- Follow all instructions on the Return/Identification Envelope. To be valid, ballots must be received no later than 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, November 3, 1992.
- POSTMARKS ARE NOT ACCEPTED.**

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOTS: If you have spoiled or damaged your ballot, please call the Registrar of Voters Office at 694-3415 for assistance.

ENVIRONMENTAL NOTICE: A styrene pad is provided to each mail ballot voter to ensure that ballots are punched cleanly and that every vote counts. This styrene pad contains NO Fluorocarbons and does not damage the ozone layer. Although the pads are not biodegradable, they can be recycled if voters return them with their voted ballots.

Recycle local and state sample ballot pamphlets. For the location of your nearest newspaper recycling center, call Recycling Hotline: 1-800-237-2583 or 270-8189.

SAVE \$\$

DUPLICATE MAILING NOTICE

SAVE \$\$

If a voter receives more than one sample ballot, please call the Registrar of Voters at: 694-3445 or toll free 1-800-696-0136. This phone call will improve the accuracy of Voter Registration records and save taxpayer dollars by reducing printing and mailing costs.

**GENERAL ELECTION
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1992**

INSTRUCTIONS - VOTING AT THE POLLS

- STEP 1. Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic device.
- STEP 2. Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.
- STEP 3. To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, punch through the ballot card at the point of the arrow after the name of the candidate. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch through the ballot card at the point of the arrow after the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.
To vote on any measure, punch through the ballot card at the point of the arrow after the word "YES" or after the word "NO".
- STEP 4. After voting, lift ballot card from red pins and withdraw the ballot card from the device. Remove any punchouts still hanging on the back of the ballot card.
- STEP 5. To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, who is **not listed** on the ballot, write the name of the office and the candidate's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the fold-over portion of the ballot card. Follow instructions at top of ballot card or request information from a precinct board member.
- STEP 6. Fold the ballot card at the perforation (as demonstrated at the polls), with the printing inside for secrecy, and return it to the precinct board member.
- NOTE: If you make a mistake, return your ballot card to the precinct board member and obtain another. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

VOTER ALERT: YOU MAY NOW RESIDE IN DIFFERENT DISTRICTS

Based on population figures from the 1990 census, the district boundary lines for U. S. Congress, State Senate, State Assembly, State Board of Equalization, County Board of Supervisors, County Board of Education and San Diego City Council were changed to achieve a more equal balance of representation.

With these changes to district boundaries, you may now reside in different districts or have new representation. These changes are effective for this election and are reflected in this sample ballot pamphlet, where applicable.

If you need further information regarding new district boundaries or your representatives, please call 694-3400.

**GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT**

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Vote for One Party

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES	GEORGE BUSH , For President	Republican	2 → ○
	DAN QUAYLE , For Vice President		
	ANDRE MARROU , For President	Libertarian	4 → ○
	NANCY LORD , For Vice President		
	ROSS PEROT , For President	Independent	6 → ○
	JAMES STOCKDALE , For Vice President		
	HOWARD PHILLIPS , For President	American Independent	8 → ○
	ALBION KNIGHT , For Vice President		
	RON DANIELS , For President	Peace & Freedom	10 → ○
	ASIBA TUPAHACHE , For Vice President		
	BILL CLINTON , For President	Democratic	12 → ●
	AL GORE , For Vice President		

UNITED STATES SENATOR

Vote for One

FULL TERM (6 YEARS)	BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN Television Commentator/Educator	Republican	15 → ○
	GENEVIEVE TORRES Cancer Researcher	Peace & Freedom	16 → ○
	BARBARA BOXER Congresswoman	Democratic	17 → ●
	JUNE R. GENIS Computer Programmer	Libertarian	18 → ○
	JEROME "JERRY" MC CREADY Businessman	American Independent	19 → ○

UNITED STATES SENATOR

Vote for One

SHORT TERM (2 YEARS)	PAUL MEEUWENBERG Marketing Consultant	American Independent	21 → ○
	GERALD HORNE Teacher	Peace & Freedom	22 → ○
	DIANNE FEINSTEIN	Democratic	23 → ●
	JOHN SEYMOUR Appointed United States Senator	Republican	24 → ○
	RICHARD B. BODDIE Adjunct Professor/Mediator	Libertarian	25 → ○

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

Vote for One

50TH DISTRICT	TONY VALENCIA Educator	Republican	28 → ○
	BOB FILNER City Councilman/Educator	Democratic	29 → ●
	ROGER B. BATCHELDER Peon	Peace & Freedom	30 → ○
	BARBARA HUTCHINSON Tax Researcher	Libertarian	31 → ○

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY

Vote for One

79TH DISTRICT	RAUL SILVA-MARTINEZ Businessman	Republican	39 → ○
	JAMES R. TRAIN Materials Manager	Libertarian	40 → ○
	STEVE PEACE Member of the Assembly, California State Legislature	Democratic	41 → ●
	EDUARDO A. PRUD-HOME Stock Clerk	Peace & Freedom	42 → ○

COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Vote for One

1ST DISTRICT	BARBARA CARPENTER Professor/Education Consultant	46 → ○
	JOHN WITT College Professor, Engineer	47 → ●

SAMPLE

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICIAL BALLOT

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Vote for One

MEMBER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES DISTRICT B	ROBERT G. DIXON Engineering Manager	54 ➡ <input type="radio"/>
	FRED COLBY Community College Trustee	55 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>

Vote for One

MEMBER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES DISTRICT D	EVONNE SCHULZE Member-San Diego Community College Board of Trustees	57 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>
	ROD VAN ORDEN Public Employee	58 ➡ <input type="radio"/>

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Vote for One

MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT A	ANN ARMSTRONG President, Board of Education	67 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>
	GEORGE R. VOJTKO Educator	68 ➡ <input type="radio"/>

Vote for One

MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT D	RON OTTINGER School Reform Coordinator	70 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>

Vote for One

MEMBER, BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT E	RHOENNA ARMSTER Education Reform Coordinator	73 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>
	SHIRLEY N. WEBER Member of the San Diego Board of Education	74 ➡ <input checked="" type="radio"/>

SAMPLE

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Vote for One

MAYOR	PETER NAVARRO Business Professor/PLANI Chairperson	106 → ○
	SUSAN GOLDING San Diego County Supervisor	107 → ●



GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS - STATE

PROP 155	1992 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars (\$900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.	184	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		185	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 156	PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs.	187	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		188	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 157	TOLL ROADS AND HIGHWAYS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Provides that state toll roads and highways leased to private entities shall become toll free within 35 years. Permits suspension of this provision by two-thirds vote of Legislature. Fiscal Impact: This measure would result in the potential loss of a revenue source for highway maintenance and operations, beginning no earlier than the year 2030. Potential loss could be tens of millions of dollars annually.	191	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		192	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 158	OFFICE OF CALIFORNIA ANALYST. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Creates the Office of California Analyst to replace the present Legislative Analyst and exempts costs from the Constitution's Proposition 140 limit on legislative costs. Fiscal Impact: Potential state costs and savings, depending on actions in annual budget process. Net impact is unknown, but probably not significant.	195	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		196	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 159	OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Establishes the Auditor General as a Constitutional office and excludes audit costs from the Constitution's Proposition 140 limit on legislative costs. Fiscal Impact: Potential state costs and savings from expanded audit activity. Net impact is unknown, but probably not significant.	199	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		200	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 160	PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Permits Legislature to exempt from property taxation the home of a person (or person's spouse) who died while on active military duty from a service-connected injury or disease. Fiscal Impact: No direct impact. If the Legislature establishes a new exemption, it could reduce local property tax revenues by potentially millions of dollars annually.	203	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		204	NO → <input type="radio"/>
PROP 161	PHYSICIAN-ASSISTED DEATH. TERMINAL CONDITION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Establishes right of mentally competent adult to request willing physician to assist in dying in the event terminal condition is diagnosed. Declares "not suicide." Physician not liable. Prohibits effect on insurance. Fiscal Impact: Potential costs and savings to state and local government health programs. Net impact is unknown, but probably not significant.	207	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		208	NO → <input type="radio"/>

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

STATE (CONTINUED)

PROP 162	PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEMS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Grants boards of public employee retirement systems sole authority over investments and administration, including actuarial services. Restricts changes to boards. Gives precedence to duty to participants and beneficiaries. Fiscal Impact: Unknown impact on public pension costs from increasing governing boards' authority. Potential public costs from giving priority to providing benefits for members and beneficiaries. Annual actuarial savings of \$1 million to \$3 million to the state's pension system.	213	YES → <input type="radio"/>
		214	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
PROP 163	ENDS TAXATION OF CERTAIN FOOD PRODUCTS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Prohibits sales or use taxes on food products exempt from taxation. Exempts candy, bottled water, and snack foods from sales and use taxation. Fiscal Impact: Reduces sales and use tax revenue to the state by \$210 million in 1992-93 and \$330 million annually thereafter. Reduces sales and use tax revenue to local governments by \$70 million in 1992-93 and \$120 million annually thereafter.	217	YES → <input type="radio"/>
		218	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
PROP 164	CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. For seats in U.S. Congress, denies ballot access to persons who have already held such office for specified period. Does not count pre-1993 service. Does not restrict "write-in" candidates. Fiscal Impact: No direct fiscal impact. If the measure results in more write-in candidates, counties would incur additional elections-related costs to count write-in votes. These costs probably would not be significant on a statewide basis.	221	YES → <input type="radio"/>
		222	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
PROP 165	BUDGET PROCESS. WELFARE. PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Grants Governor constitutional power to reduce certain expenditures to balance budget during "fiscal emergency." Amends statutes to reduce certain benefits in specified welfare programs. Fiscal Impact: Budget: potential state savings or costs up to several hundred million or billions in some years. Welfare: state savings of \$680 million annually, increasing significantly in future; county savings from \$80 million to several hundred million annually.	226	YES → <input type="radio"/>
		227	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
PROP 166	BASIC HEALTH CARE COVERAGE. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Requires employers to provide health care coverage for most employees and dependents. Implements as federal law permits. Limits employee contributions. Specifies benefits. Provides employer tax credits. Establishes administrative bodies. Appropriates money. Fiscal Impact: Potential state revenue losses of several hundred million dollars annually coupled with potential savings in the Medi-Cal program of approximately \$250 million annually. Potential county savings of over \$100 million annually. Net fiscal impact is unknown.	231	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
		232	NO → <input type="radio"/>

**GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT**

PROP 167 STATE TAXES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Increases taxes on top personal income taxpayers, corporations, banks, insurance companies, and oil producers. Repeals 1991 sales tax increases. Provides for renters' tax credits. Changes business-owned real property reappraisal rule. Fiscal Impact: Net state gains of \$560 million to \$910 million annually from 1993-94 through 1995-96; thereafter, approximately an additional \$1 billion annually. Net increase in revenues to local governments of \$550 million to \$1.2 billion beginning 1993-94.	238	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
	239	NO → <input type="radio"/>

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

PROPA SAN DIEGO COUNTY JUSTICE-RELATED FACILITIES, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIME PREVENTION FINANCING ORDINANCE AND INCREASE IN THE APPROPRIATION LIMIT OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO. Shall approval be given to (1) an ordinance of the County of San Diego imposing a one-half of one percent retail transactions and use tax to be used solely for the provision, construction, and operating expenses of justice-related facilities and specified related matters, and law enforcement activities and crime prevention projects, and (2) an increase in the appropriation limit of the County of San Diego in the amount equal to the amount of such tax to be collected?	245	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	246	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>

PROPB PROPOSED "JUST SAY NO" AMENDMENT TO THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER LIMITING THE VALIDITY OF ANY PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS IMPOSING MANDATORY COSTS. Shall the San Diego County Charter be amended by adding Section 805 to the Charter which would require that for any proposed Charter amendment imposing mandatory costs to be valid, the proposed Charter amendment must be accompanied by a new and legally available funding source?	249	YES → <input checked="" type="radio"/>
	250	NO → <input type="radio"/>

PROPC PROPOSED INITIATIVE MEASURE AMENDING THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER TO PROVIDE FOR MINIMUM STAFFING FOR THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. Shall Section 605 of the San Diego County Charter be amended which (1) would impose a mandatory requirement on the County Board of Supervisors to allocate sufficient funds to employ minimum numbers of deputy sheriffs based upon the number of inhabitants of the unincorporated areas of the County and minimum numbers of correctional deputy sheriffs based upon the number of inmates in the Sheriff detention facilities, and (2) would impose a mandatory requirement on the Sheriff to appoint, direct and supervise such minimum numbers of deputy sheriffs and correctional deputy sheriffs?	255	YES → <input type="radio"/>
	256	NO → <input checked="" type="radio"/>

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

PROP D

AMENDS SECTION 103 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO AND AMENDS ORDINANCE NOS. 10465 AND 10466, OF THE CITY OF SAN

DIEGO PERTAINING TO FRANCHISES GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY. Amends Section 103 of the Charter of the City of San Diego, and the gas and electric franchises currently held by San Diego Gas & Electric Company, to provide that a transfer of the franchise is required to be approved by the City Council when there is any change in the legal structure of the franchise holder which alters the ownership or control of the franchise holder. Changes in legal structure are defined to include, but not necessarily be limited to, sale, lease, assignment, corporate merger, stock swap, leveraged buy-out reorganization or any other method which changes the ownership or control of the franchise holder. These amendments are intended to be declaratory in nature as a clarification of existing transfer provisions in the Charter and in the various City franchises presently in existence.

268

YES → ●

269

NO → ○

PROPE

AMENDS SECTIONS 10 AND 12 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Amends Charter section 10 to require that commencing with the year 1996,

the municipal primary elections to the office of Council member for districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year. Commencing with the year 1998, the municipal primary elections to the offices of Council member for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year.

Amends Charter Section 12 to provide that, at the municipal primary and general elections in 1993, Council members for districts, 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3) years. Provides that Council members for districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter. Provides that, at the municipal primary and general election in 1995, Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6 and 8 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3) years. Provides that, Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter.

279

YES → ●

280

NO → ○

GENERAL ELECTION - NOVEMBER 3, 1992 - SAN DIEGO COUNTY
OFFICIAL BALLOT

CITY OF SAN DIEGO (CONTINUED)

PROPF**AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO BY AMENDING SECTION 55.** Amends Section 55 of the City Charter by deleting existing language

which authorizes the City Council, without a vote of the people, to establish streets and highways through dedicated public parks. Language is added to Charter Section 55 to require an annual review by the City Council of all property owned by the City which may be suitable for park dedication, and requires such dedication where the Council does not find that dedication is contrary to the public interest. Language is also added which allows the City Council by a two-thirds vote to authorize the realignment or widening of existing streets in dedicated parks. Specific language is added to require a majority vote of the qualified electors of the City voting at an election in order to establish new non-park roads through dedicated public parks. The words "or later ratified" are also stricken from the existing language to preclude the City Council's authorization of a non-park use of dedicated park land prior to voter authorization.

294

YES → ☐

295

NO → ☐**PROPG****AMENDS SECTION 66 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.** Establishes that San Diego Unified School District Board members shall be nominated, elected, and recalled by district rather than nominated by district

and elected citywide.

Provides Notice to the Voter, as follows: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition H, which would increase the number of Board members from 5 to 7, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter section 66.

301

YES → ☒

302

NO → ☐**PROPH****AMENDS SECTION 66 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.** Increases the number of seats on the San Diego Unified School District Board from

five (5) to seven (7) commencing in 1994.

Provides Notice to the Voter, as follows: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition G, which would establish that San Diego Unified School District Board members shall be nominated, elected and recalled by district rather than nominated by district and elected citywide, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter section 66.

308

YES → ☐

309

NO → ☒

VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

The following pages contain

CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS

together with the

BALLOT MEASURES, ANALYSES, ARGUMENTS AND REBUTTALS

(whichever is applicable to your ballot)

ARGUMENTS AND/OR REBUTTALS

Arguments in support of or in opposition to the proposed measures are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS

Although all candidates had the opportunity to submit a statement, the following pages may not contain a statement for every candidate, as some candidates chose not to submit one. A complete list of candidates appears on the "SAMPLE" of the Official Ballot in this pamphlet. The statements are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
District No. 1

BARBARA CARPENTER
Professor/Education Consultant

BARBARA CARPENTER has a Ph.D. and an M.A. in Educational Studies from the University of Connecticut. She is a member of the Core Adjunct Faculty at National University's School of Education and serves on its Advisory Board. She teaches graduate courses for teacher certification and educational counseling; supervises students in field-work assignments; and lectures on educational issues throughout the state.

BARBARA CARPENTER is a Project Coordinator for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Funds and counsels high school students in career development and higher education planning. She has been chosen as an alternate to the 1992 Legal Compliance Committee of the State Department of Education to review textbooks and instructional material.

BARBARA CARPENTER has served eighteen years on community boards and is skilled in budget development and program assessment. She was formerly a member of the Site Council of Skyline Elementary School, which won statewide recognition for excellence in education. While raising four children, she devoted many years to PTA programs. Recently, two of her children graduated from California universities, Stanford and UCLA.

BARBARA CARPENTER understands the complexity of education. Her advanced training and experience make her a highly qualified candidate. She asks for your vote.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
District No. 1

JOHN WITT
College Professor/Registered Professional Engineer

Primary Winner over 8 Opponents.

John Witt, past president and 13-year veteran of the San Diego City Schools Board of Education, brings to the County Board of Education the experience necessary to benefit the city and county schools.

EXPERIENCE: As a former San Diego City Schools Board of Education member, JOHN WITT advocated increased homework and higher graduation standards that helped raise test scores. He worked to develop the effective DARE program; expanded drug abuse prevention efforts; voted to consolidate school sites, thus reducing overhead; and supported revenue measures to fund growth area school construction. He successfully opposed forced busing, and helped implement magnet schools.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: California State and San Diego County School Board Associations delegate, Science Fair judge, Madison High Band Parents and PTA member, Little League umpire, Pop Warner Football vice-president.

PROFESSIONAL: Mathematics professor at City College and Mesa College, former teacher at Lewis Junior High and Lincoln Senior High. Registered Professional Engineer with experience at Convair and General Atomic, Navy veteran - U.S.S. Coral Sea.

EDUCATION: University of Illinois, B.S., Engineering; San Diego State University, M.S., Engineering; University of San Diego, Graduate Studies, School of Law.

PERSONAL: Married 38 years, three children graduated from San Diego schools, four grandchildren.

ANY QUESTIONS? Call JOHN WITT at 685-2051

N SD 272-13

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Member, Board of Trustees - District B

ROBERT DIXON
Engineering Manager

When Elected, I Will Return \$10,000 of My Salary for Student Scholarships

QUALIFICATIONS

- EXPERIENCE** Robert Dixon is the only candidate with college level teaching experience. (Adjunct Faculty, Department of Mechanical Engineering, SDSU)
- KNOWLEDGE** Robert Dixon is the only candidate with an advanced degree. (M.S. Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
- OBJECTIVITY** Robert Dixon is the only candidate who has REFUSED campaign contributions and endorsements from big business and government. (Campaign financed entirely through small individual contributions)
- COMMITMENT** Robert Dixon is the only candidate who has stated that he will not use this office as a "stepping stone" to a higher political position. (Navaho News, June 1, 1992)

Prior to their election, some board members complained that their predecessors voted themselves a 100% pay increase (\$9,000 to \$18,000 per year). Yet, when elected, they cheerfully accepted this salary increase. Robert Dixon will restore his salary to previous levels by returning \$10,000 of his annual salary to be used as scholarships for students in the San Diego Community College District.

Prior to their election, some board members complained that their predecessors voted themselves lifetime health benefits. Yet, once elected, they voted to abolish these same benefits for District administration while preserving them for themselves! This injustice was later rectified due to public outrage.

Some board members say they "trimmed administrative structure" in the District yet actually created a completely new position of vice chancellor—a glaring contradiction.

IT'S TIME FOR HONESTY AND LEADERSHIP

Robert Dixon Will:

- Refocus Attention on the Needs of the Students
- Consider the Valuable Input of District Faculty
- Work to Establish Outreach Programs for Inner City Students
- Encourage More Active Participation From Business and Community Groups
- Hold Regular Meetings at Each Campus to Stay in Touch with the Needs of Students and Faculty

Vote For a Change. Vote For Robert Dixon.

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Member, Board of Trustees - District B

FRED COLBY

Age: 44

Community College Trustee

Education

Claremont McKenna College,
Cum Laude, B.A.
Mesa Community College

Family

Married: 22 years
Wife: Theresa Colby
Children: Jennifer, Charlene

CURRENT AND PAST POSITIONS

- * Executive Director, S.D. Foundation for Performing Arts
- * President, S.D. Community College Board of Trustees
- * Member, Joint County & Schools Coalition
- * Chairman, Mira Mesa/Scripps Ranch Citizens for Schools
- * Member, Miramar Ranch North Planning Group

IN THE DISTRICT PRIMARY ELECTION FRED COLBY RECEIVED OVER 62% OF THE VOTES.

As a 36 year resident of San Diego, Fred Colby believes in our city, and cares enough to work for its future. He ran for office four years ago to bring change to our community colleges.

FRED PROMISED TO SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS, RESTORE FACULTY MORALE, REDUCE ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD, AND IMPROVE PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS.
THE RECORD OF THE PAST FOUR YEARS DEMONSTRATES SUCCESS:

- * **Recovered \$9 million of taxpayer money** through settlement of a major lawsuit involving a Community College Foundation
- * **Improved student retention and performance** through new tutorial, mentoring, and independent learning programs
- * **Saved tax dollars** by trimming administrative overhead
- * Launched nationally acclaimed New Beginnings program
- * Received state & national honors for hiring of minorities
- * Developed sound responses to state's fiscal crisis
- * **Restored faculty and staff morale**
- * Secured state funds for construction of new facilities
- * **Re-established our District's reputation** as one of the best
- * Expanded health services for college students

"These successes were achieved through a team effort by the entire Board and staff. Together with a new Chancellor and three new Board members we have instilled a spirit of change in our district. Continuity in leadership is imperative as we face California's fiscal and social crisis."
Fred Colby

CONTINUED CHANGE IS NEEDED. FRED'S GOALS FOR THE NEXT 4 YEARS INCLUDE:

- * Develop programs to **assist unemployed** in learning skills necessary to secure new jobs
- * **Implement state level reform legislation** for Adult Education
- * Re-evaluate all college operations in order to **realize more savings** to counter shrinking state funding
- * Resolve overwhelming parking problem at Mesa College
- * **Secure new state funding** to complete Miramar College & expand ECC

"AS THE FATHER OF TWO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF OUR COMMUNITY COLLEGES. PLEASE HELP ME TO CONTINUE OUR GOOD WORK AND TO BRING CHANGE TO OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. THANK YOU." Fred Colby

N SD 272-15

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Member, Board of Trustees - District D

EVONNE SCHULZE

Member - Board of Trustees

Thank you San Diego for giving me 70% of the vote in the primary election. I shall continue to speak out for public education as our number one priority to maintain a free and open society.

I am very proud of the accomplishments of our Board over the past 4 years:

- * We have successfully **POOLED OUR LIMITED RESOURCES** with San Diego County, the City of San Diego and City Schools to initiate New Beginnings, the first one-stop service center for families and students in San Diego, housed at Hamilton Elementary School.
- * We **REDUCED MANAGEMENT** by 20% and concentrated our resources in the classroom.
- * While serving as President we settled the Community College Foundation lawsuit that **RETURNED \$9 MILLION OF TAXPAYERS MONEY** to the District.
- * We **OPENED THE SAN DIEGO CAREER CENTER** in cooperation with The Private Industry Council and the California Employment Development Department to provide career assessment, job training and retraining and job placement.
- * My efforts successfully **STRENGTHENED AND SIMPLIFIED THE TRANSFER PROCESS** from our District to the University of California and California State University systems.
- * During my presidency, we **OPENED THE NEW POLICE AND FIRE SCIENCE INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY** and improved the already nationally recognized training programs at Miramar College.

EDUCATION

San Diego State University, Mott Foundation Graduate Fellowship
Education/Administration
Northwestern University, Bachelor of Science

PREVIOUS PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

San Diego State University-Department of Public Administration
Adjunct Faculty
California Community College Board of Governors - Member
San Diego City Schools - Director of Community Education

PREVIOUS COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

San Diego Ecology Center - President
San Diego Youth & Community Services - Board Member
San Diego County Department of Education Personnel Commission - Chair

AWARDS AND HONORS

California Community Educator of the Year
Woman of the Year in Education - California Women in Government
Woman of Accomplishment - Soroptimist International of San Diego

ENDORSEMENTS (partial list)

National Womens Political Caucus - (NWPC)
National Organization for Women - (NOW-PAC)
San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council - COPE
Service Employees International - (SEIU #53)

My goal has been, and will continue to be, to do everything I can to guarantee San Diegans access to the best, most affordable, state-of-the-art public education offered by any Community College system in the nation. I would appreciate your vote on **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3.**

Thank you, Evonne

SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Member, Board of Trustees - District D

ROD VAN ORDEN

Age: 42

Public Employee

LEADERSHIP AND HONESTY

EDUCATION.

STUDENTS AND TAXPAYERS ARE BEARING THE BURDEN OF FINANCIAL CHAOS CREATED BY THE INCUMBENTS. IT IS A GRAVE INJUSTICE. WE NEED STRONG LEADERSHIP TO STAND UP AND FIGHT FOR OUR COMMUNITY. WE MUST LOBBY VERY HEAVILY AND DEMAND THE ABOLITION OF THE CAP ON AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE FUNDING FOR SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

JOBS.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE VITAL IN OUR EFFORTS TO END SAN DIEGO'S HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT. PARTNERSHIP WITH LOCAL BUSINESS AND JOB SITE TEACHING SHOULD BE FOSTERED EVERYWHERE. CHARGING \$600 PER SEMESTER FOR STUDENTS WITH DEGREES MUST BE OPPOSED. THAT IS AN UNREASONABLY HEAVY BURDEN.

INTEGRITY.

FOUR YEARS AGO THE ELECTION DUST HAD BARELY SETTLED WHEN PROMISES NOT TO RAISE STUDENT FEES WERE FORGOTTEN. IS IT ANY WONDER THAT PEOPLE DO NOT TRUST POLITICIANS? ITS TIME TO ELECT A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PEOPLE, NOT A CAREER POLITICIAN. ITS TIME TO BRING BACK LEADERSHIP YOU CAN TRUST. ITS TIME TO ELECT ROD VAN ORDEN.

QUALIFICATIONS

EDUCATION

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| ASSOCIATE OF ARTS DEGREE | - ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE |
| BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE | - CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CAL STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH |

LEADERSHIP

EAGLE SCOUT AWARD
LIEUTENANT, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE
COMMISSIONER, SAN DIEGO COUNTY COMMISSION ON
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION BICENTENNIAL

CRISES MANAGEMENT

TEN YEARS OF MILITARY SERVICE IN USAF AND USNR
NATIONAL DEFENSE SERVICE AWARD FOR PARTICIPATION
IN DESERT SHIELD AND DESERT STORM

VOTE "PRO-CHOICE" ON ELECTION DAY. ELECT ROD VAN ORDEN

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Member, Board of Education - District A



ANN ARMSTRONG
President, Board of Education

PRIMARY WINNER BY 2 TO 1 MARGIN
WINNING IN EVERY PRECINCT

A COMMITMENT TO QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Shrinking budgets mean we must find ways to do more with less. Every child has a right to a quality public education. I will continue to do everything in my power to fulfill that promise.

A RECORD OF CHANGE

I am proud of our Board's accomplishments during the past four years.

- * Increased parent involvement in school decisions.
- * Strengthened basic reading, writing, and social studies.
- * Expanded drug/alcohol/AIDS education.
- * Streamlined the bureaucracy and gave individual school sites more decision making authority.
- * Increased teacher and administrator accountability.
- * Offered more educational choices to parents.
- * Worked to get San Diego's fair share of funding from Sacramento.

PROVEN LEADERSHIP

- * President, San Diego Unified PTA Council, 1987-88
- * 25 years of PTA Board leadership
- * Board member, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Task Force (ADAPT)
- * Delegate Assembly, California School Boards Association
- * Member, City-wide Parent Involvement Task Force
- * Founding member, University City Civic Association
- * 12-year member, National Conference of Christians and Jews Education Committee

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

- * Married, parent of three children educated in San Diego public schools

ANN ARMSTRONG: THE CHOICE FOR QUALITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, & CHANGE

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Member, Board of Education - District A



GEORGE R. VOJTKO
Educator
BS and Masters Degrees

OUR DISTRICT NEEDS QUALIFIED REPRESENTATION

In the present school crisis, we need qualified representation if we are to raise scholastic achievement. I have those qualifications. . . credentials, classroom experience, and training in developing curricula. You can count on me to provide the kind of representation you want.

GEORGE VOJTKO . . . EXPERIENCED

- LIFETIME of TEACHING . . . at Elementary, Secondary, College and Teacher Education levels . . . with SCHOOL BOARD EXPERIENCE.
- SUPERVISOR of Student-Teachers . . . active professional member of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- PARENT of six children . . . all graduating from La Jolla High School.
- DEDICATION and DRIVE to serve YOU. Knows you want practical SOLUTIONS.

GEORGE VOJTKO . . . BELIEVES IN QUALITY

- COMMITMENT to LEARNING and HARD WORK on the part of students.
- VALUE-BASED education . . . loyalty, ethics, cooperation and trust.
- EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION . . . reading, writing, speaking and computing.
- FOSTERING the intellect . . . ARTS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, MATH and LANGUAGES.
- GLOBAL teaching PERSPECTIVE . . . appreciation for DIVERSITY of CULTURES.

GEORGE VOJTKO . . . SEEKS

- DRUG FREE . . . GANG FREE . . . CRIME FREE . . . NON-VIOLENT SCHOOLS.
- SOLUTIONS to means of FINANCING education for our children.
- PARENTAL and COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT in education . . . believes the whole system must "work harder and smarter!"

ELECT GEORGE VOJTKO
EXPERIENCED . . . COMMITTED . . . CONCERNED

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Member, Board of Education - District D



RON OTTINGER
School Reform Leader
Public School Parent

ENDORSED BY:

IRMA CASTRO, Former Chicano Federation Director
CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
LEE GRISSOM, Chamber of Commerce Past President
EVELYN HERRMANN, Ret. Dir., S.D. Senior Programs
NGUYEN VAN NGHI, Refugee Community Leader
SAN DIEGO TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
SEIU, Joint Council #53
REV. GEORGE WALKER SMITH, Christ United
Presbyterian Church

RON OTTINGER - HANDS-ON SCHOOL REFORM EXPERIENCE

- Chief staff, San Diego Schools of the Future Commission
- Chief staff, San Diego Dropout Prevention and Recovery Round Table
- Secretary-Treasurer, Parent Institute for Quality Education
- Board Member, San Diegans United for Safe Neighborhoods

RON OTTINGER - COMMITMENT TO ACTION

- **CREATE SAFE SCHOOLS** - Zero tolerance for drugs, weapons, and violence in schools. Apply assertive discipline and positive alternatives, and promote community action.
- **REDUCE CLASS SIZE** - Measurable class size reduction each of the next four years.
- **PUT OUR MONEY AND STAFF WHERE THE STUDENTS ARE** - Put them where they make the biggest difference - in the classroom.
- **CREATE SCHOOLS THAT WORK FOR ALL STUDENTS** - including those in basic and special programs.
- **SCHOOLS OPEN FROM 6 TO 6** - Establish affordable latchkey programs in each neighborhood.
- **HOLD SCHOOL BOARD, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS ACCOUNTABLE** - I expect to be held accountable for making our schools work.

RON OTTINGER - FOR SCHOOLS THAT WORK!

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Member, Board of Education - District E



DR. RHOENNA ARMSTER
Education Reform Leader

MADE AN IMPRESSIVE SHOWING IN THE PRIMARY!
WON IN SEVERAL PRECINCTS!

DR. RHOENNA ARMSTER IS A TEACHER INSIDE THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. SHE SEES THE PROBLEMS AND SHE KNOWS THE SOLUTIONS!

District schools are not getting better. Uncontrolled discipline is rampant. Too many school board members are tolerating poor teaching and ineffective leadership. Our children no longer come first!

IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE!

Rhoenna Armster has decided to put her teaching career with city schools on hold to work for change!

EDUCATION: Ph.D. - Leadership & Human Behavior
MBA - Emphasis - Financial Management
MA - Business Education

EXPERIENCE: Teacher of the Year - 1988 - San Diego City Schools
Business Education Department Chairperson - 10 years
26 years of successful teaching

DR. ARMSTER IS COMMITTED TO:

- creative budgetary and fiscal management techniques.
- high academic and behavioral standards applied equally for all students.
- cooperative efforts and participation of staff, parents, students, community, and business/industry.
- a strong comprehensive curriculum to prepare students for college, school-work transition, and global competition.

Dr. Rhoenna Armster was recognized as the district's teacher of the year in 1988 because she expects excellence and demands accountability. You deserve the same from your schools!

ELECT RHOENNA ARMSTER - THE CHOICE FOR EXCELLENCE!

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Member, Board of Education - District E



SHIRLEY WEBER
Member, Board of Education and
San Diego State University Professor

LANDSLIDE VICTORY IN THE PRIMARY - 64%
WINNER IN 96% OF THE PRECINCTS

CLEARLY THE DISTRICT'S CHOICE!!

DR. SHIRLEY WEBER: the DISTRICT'S CHOICE because she GETS RESULTS:

- * 50% decrease in the drop out rate
- * Challenging curriculum for all students
- * Greater accountability for student achievement
- * More technology in schools
- * New and remodeled schools to relieve overcrowding
- * Vocational Education for the 21st Century
- * Mandated Parent Involvement Policy
- * Increased business partnerships

DR. WEBER: the DISTRICT'S CHOICE because of her LIFETIME COMMITMENT TO EXCELLENCE:

- * BA, MA and PhD in Communications, UCLA
- * SDSU Outstanding Faculty Award, 1982, 1987, 1990
- * Membership on two national school reform boards
- * Professor and Administrator at SDSU for twenty years
- * Charter member of Encanto's PTA

Dr. Weber is the wife of a local attorney, and the mother of two children attending public schools.

Dear Friends,

Thank you for your **overwhelming support** in the primary. As a parent with children in public schools, I see the successes and failures of our system. My goal as your board member has been to develop a system that is responsive to the needs of every child in San Diego. We have begun the process of reform. **With your support on November 3, we can reach our goal.**

Shirley

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor**



SUSAN GOLDING
San Diego County Supervisor

EXPERIENCE:

**California Deputy Secretary,
Business, Transportation and
Housing**

Businesswoman

ENDORSED BY SAN DIEGO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Endorsed by the Bernardo News because:

San Diego needs a strong leader; a person with a new vision, knowledge, and commitment . . . Susan Golding is that person.

VIGOROUS, INDEPENDENT LEADERSHIP

Our economy is in trouble. We need performance, not theories. Golding will -

- * Fight to keep San Diego businesses
- * Cut the size of government instead of raising taxes
- * Restore common sense
- * Get our economy moving again

When bureaucrats wanted to cut services, Golding cut her own salary instead.

Susan Golding knows it takes cooperation, not confrontation, to protect our quality of life. She is a recognized leader in protecting our environment.

Honored for outstanding achievement by the Council of Environmental Organizations.

MAKE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS AND FAMILIES SAFE.

- * Doubled law enforcement budget
 - * Established the Drug Court that sent over 1,000 criminals to prison.
 - * Will put more police on our streets
 - * Will attack causes of crime - drug use, school drop-outs and unemployment.
 - * Will restore neighborhoods and give them a voice
-

Endorsed by San Diego Voice & Viewpoint because: she has demonstrated the sensitivity and ability to lead with fairness.

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor**



PETER NAVARRO

**Married, 43
Business Professor
University of California**

**CHAIRPERSON, PLANI, PREVENT LOS ANGELIZATION NOW!
ENDORSED BY THE SIERRA CLUB**

The Antidote to Politics as Usual

Unmanaged growth, economic stagnation, and soaring crime are overwhelming San Diego because special interests control our government. San Diego's next mayor must preserve our city, not sell it to the highest bidder.

Don't Yield to Developers

PETER NAVARRO:

- * San Diego's growth management and environmental leader
- * The candidate Los Angeles developers fear most
- * Authored the Planned Growth/Taxpayer Relief Initiative

Crime-Free Zone Ahead

PETER NAVARRO, author of the PLANI POLICE INITIATIVE, will:

- * Put more police on our streets - without raising taxes
- * Expand police-community partnerships
- * Create crime victim restitution programs

A Business Professor to Build a Strong Economic Future

PETER NAVARRO, an economist with a doctorate from Harvard, has written a Business and Industrial Policy to:

- * Protect manufacturing jobs and create opportunities for high-tech industries
- * Foster business-labor-education cooperation
- * Eliminate city taxes/red tape for small businesses

Don't Yield to Politicians

PETER NAVARRO will:

- * Reform campaign finance laws
- * Hold evening council meetings in your neighborhood
- * Fight unscrupulous developers' stranglehold on our city
- * Provide non-partisan leadership for San Diego

Tired of Career Politicians?

ELECT PETER NAVARRO MAYOR

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition A

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

PROP A

SAN DIEGO COUNTY JUSTICE-RELATED FACILITIES, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIME PREVENTION FINANCING ORDINANCE AND INCREASE IN THE APPROPRIATION LIMIT OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO. Shall approval be given to (1) an ordinance of the County of San Diego imposing a one-half of one percent retail transactions and use tax to be used solely for the provision, construction, and operating expenses of justice-related facilities and specified related matters, and law enforcement activities and crime prevention projects, and (2) an increase in the appropriation limit of the County of San Diego in the amount equal to the amount of such tax to be collected?

PROPOSED ORDINANCE

The people of the County of San Diego ordain as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 8127 (NEW SERIES)

AN ORDINANCE ADDING CHAPTER 1.5 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 22.150) TO DIVISION 2 OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY JUSTICE-RELATED FACILITIES, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIME PREVENTION, IMPOSING A COUNTYWIDE RETAIL TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX, AND INCREASING THE COUNTY CONSTITUTIONAL APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 1.5 (commencing with section 22.150) is hereby added to the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances to read as follows:

CHAPTER 1.5

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY JUSTICE-RELATED FACILITIES,
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIME PREVENTION FINANCING ORDINANCE**

Sec. 22.150. PURPOSE AND INTENT

The County of San Diego as a regional government is required to provide justice-related facilities such as courts and jails for the people of the County of San Diego in order to promote their health, safety, and welfare. The overcrowding of existing regional justice-related facilities impedes the administration of justice and endangers society by the release of persons due to a lack of facilities to confine them. Law enforcement and crime prevention are so inadequately funded so as to endanger the safety of persons and property in San Diego County. The County of San Diego is also authorized to fund law enforcement and crime prevention projects. The purpose of this Ordinance is to implement State law allowing the voters to decide upon a one-half of one percent (1/2%) countywide retail transactions and use tax. The proceeds of the tax will be used to finance justice-related facilities such as courts and jails and related matters, and law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects. Hereinafter, "retail transactions and use tax" shall be referred to as "sales tax."

Sec. 22.151. COUNTYWIDE SALES TAX

In addition to any other taxes authorized by law, on the operative date of this Ordinance there is hereby imposed in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County of San Diego, in accordance with chapter 2.7 (commencing with § 7286.30) of part 1.7 of division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, a sales tax at the rate of one-half of one percent (1/2%) in addition to any existing or future authorized state or local sales tax or transactions and use tax.

Sec. 22.152. EXPENDITURE PLAN

(a) Activities and projects financed with revenues generated by the sales tax authorized by this Ordinance shall be limited to the provision, construction, and operating expenses of justice-related facilities, the funding of law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects, the costs incurred by the county to conduct the election authorized by Section 7286.32, and the costs of any legal actions related to the sales tax as authorized by Chapter 259 of the statutes of 1992 and as amended.

(b) The County of San Diego shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this Ordinance, including the collection of the additional sales tax imposed by this Ordinance.

(c) After deduction of costs referred to in subsections (a) and (b) above, the revenues of the sales tax shall be allocated as follows:

1. 50% of available revenues for the provision and construction of the following County justice-related facilities:
 - East Mesa Detention Facility,
 - Central Booking,
 - Downtown Court,
 - North County Court,
 - Juvenile Dependency,
 - Small Claims & Traffic,
 - East County Regional Center Expansion,
 - South Bay Regional Center Expansion,
 - Regional Crime Lab,
 - Regional Emergency Communications Complex;
2. 25% of available revenues for operating expenses of new and existing County justice-related facilities;
3. 25% of available revenues for local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects. These revenues shall be allocated to the County for the unincorporated area of the County and to the cities within the County on a per capita basis. The allocation proportions shall be determined annually by the Auditor and Controller of the County of San Diego. Distributions of revenue shall be made quarterly.

Sec. 22.153. EFFECTIVE AND OPERATIVE DATES

(a) This Ordinance shall take effect 48 hours subsequent to the closing time of the polls on the day of the election at which the proposition is approved by the voters.

(b) The provisions of this Ordinance shall become operative on the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing more than 110 days after the Ordinance takes effect.

(c) Any reduction in the sales tax rate authorized by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to this Ordinance shall become operative on the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning 110 days or more after the Board's action authorizing the reduction.

Sec. 22.154. REDUCTION OF THE SALES TAX AND SPECIAL FUND

(a) The Board of Supervisors shall reduce the sales tax rate to one-quarter of one percent (1/4%), upon determination by the Board of Supervisors that sufficient revenue has been collected from the sales tax, together with any revenue from the case of *Rider v. County of San Diego* referred to below, to pay for the obligations incurred under this Ordinance for the provision and construction of justice-related facilities. The available revenues from the reduced sales tax rate shall be allocated as follows:

- (1) 50% of available revenues for operating expenses of new and existing County justice-related facilities;
- (2) 50% of available revenues for local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects. These revenues shall be allocated to the County for the unincorporated area of the County and to the cities within the County on a per capita basis. The allocation proportions shall be determined annually by the Auditor and Controller of the County of San Diego. Distributions of revenue shall be made quarterly.

(b) Any revenue made available to the County of San Diego as a result of a final judicial decision in the case of Rider v. County of San Diego for the provision and construction of the specific facilities authorized under this Ordinance shall be used to fund those specific facilities.

(c) The sales tax revenues shall be deposited in a special fund and used solely for the purposes authorized by this Ordinance.

Sec. 22.155. VOTER APPROVAL REQUIREMENT

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (b) of this section, the voter approval requirement for this Ordinance is two-thirds vote of the qualified voters of the county voting on the measure at the election held on November 3, 1992.

(b) In the event a constitutional amendment is submitted to the people of the State of California at the election held on November 3, 1992 to permit the imposition of a special tax with the approval of a majority of the qualified voters of the County voting on the measure, and such amendment is approved, then the voter approval requirement for this Ordinance shall be a majority of the qualified voters of the county voting on the measure at the election held on November 3, 1992.

Sec. 22.156. USE OF NEW FUNDS

The additional funds provided by this Ordinance are to supplement existing local revenues being used for the purposes funded by this Ordinance.

Sec. 22.157. INCREASE IN APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT

The appropriations limit imposed on the County of San Diego by Article XIII B of the California Constitution is hereby increased by the amount of taxes generated by the sales tax imposed by this Ordinance for the next four fiscal years following the operative date of this Ordinance.

Sec. 22.158. IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES

Upon approval of this Ordinance by the voters, the Board of Supervisors shall enact such other ordinances and take such other actions as may be necessary for the implementation of this Ordinance and the collection of the sales tax authorized by this Ordinance.

Sec. 22.159. AMENDMENTS

This Ordinance may be amended or repealed by an ordinance that becomes effective only when approved by the legally required vote of the qualified electors voting at a special election called by the Board of Supervisors for such purpose.

Sec. 22.160. SEVERABILITY

If any section, part, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining portion shall not be affected but shall remain in full force and effect.

COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS

You are asked to vote on the San Diego County Justice-Related Facilities, Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention Financing Ordinance (Ordinance) which imposes a one-half of one percent (1/2%) countywide transactions and use tax (sales tax) and increases the constitutional appropriations limit of the County of San Diego.

The major elements of the Ordinance, which have been authorized by state legislation, are as follows:

1. Imposes a sales tax of one-half of one percent (1/2%) in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County of San Diego to be used for purposes designated in the Ordinance. Available revenue from the sales tax will be allocated fifty percent for the provision and construction of specified justice-related facilities, twenty-five percent for operating expenses of new and existing County justice-related facilities, and twenty-five percent for local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects. Before the foregoing allocations are made, sales tax revenue will be allocated to fund costs of the election on the Ordinance, State Board of Equalization charges related to the sales tax, and any costs of the County for legal actions related to the sales tax.
2. Provides that the County Board of Supervisors shall reduce the sales tax to one-quarter of one percent (1/4%) upon determination that sufficient revenue has been collected from the sales tax, together with any revenue from specified litigation, to pay for the provision and construction of the specified justice-related facilities authorized by the Ordinance.
3. Provides that after the sales tax is reduced, the available revenue from the sales tax will be allocated fifty percent for operating expenses of new and existing County justice-related facilities, and fifty percent for local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects.
4. Provides that sales tax revenue for local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects will be allocated to the County, for the unincorporated area of the county, and to the cities within the county on a per capita basis.
5. Provides that the revenue from the sales tax will be used to supplement existing revenue being used for the purposes funded by the Ordinance.
6. Provides that the Ordinance may be amended or repealed only by an ordinance approved by the legally required vote of the qualified voters voting on the amendment or repeal at an election called for such a purpose.

The Ordinance will become effective only if approved by two-thirds of the qualified voters voting on the measure unless, on election day, the state Constitution has been amended to authorize approval by a majority of the qualified voters voting on the measure. If approved, the Ordinance will become effective on November 5, 1992. Collection of the sales tax authorized by the Ordinance will commence April 1, 1993.

A "Yes" vote on the proposition is a vote to adopt the Ordinance.

A "No" vote on the proposition is a vote against approving the Ordinance.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Why must you always lock the doors to your home and car? Are you afraid to use neighborhood parks at night? Why must you worry when your kids leave home? Why are you afraid to walk the streets?

Because you know that crime pays in San Diego!

In 1991, a serious crime like murder, rape or robbery was committed in San Diego County every three minutes. One household in six was burglarized or had a vehicle stolen. More than \$300 million in property was stolen from San Diego residents last year.

Why? Because thousands of criminal, thieves and muggers, know they won't go to jail if they are caught. Our jails have no more room!

PROPOSITION A will hire more police throughout the county and will build new jails for more than 4,000 criminals. Money will also be available for community crime prevention to help combat drugs and other local problems.

PROPOSITION A will build courts to eliminate delays. Funds will also be used to help operate new jail and court facilities.

A 1/2 cent increase in the sales tax is a small price to pay for a safe community. A sales tax is fair because everyone pays, including tourists. Those with limited incomes pay less. And when the facilities are completed, the tax **MUST BE CUT IN HALF** - down to only 1/4 cent. Those funds will be used to continue maintenance and operations.

For pennies a day per citizen, criminals will be taken off the streets and out of our neighborhoods.

Your vote will make the difference. **PROPOSITION A** requires a 2/3 vote to win approval so it requires a "YES" vote from nearly everyone.

Protect yourself, your loved ones, friends and neighbors.

STOP CRIME TODAY - VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A!

JIM ROACHE, Sheriff
San Diego County

GEORGE F. BAILEY, Chairman
County Board of Supervisors

BOB BURGREN, Chief of Police
City of San Diego

MEL KATZ, Chairman
Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce

EDWARD B. MEYER, Co-Exec. Director
San Diego Crime Commission

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

You always lock the doors to your home and car because elected officials in San Diego County spend your tax dollars on bureaucratic growth, not law enforcement.

- ITEM: County supervisors increased bureaucratic salaries and benefit expense from \$659 million to \$732 million in the last fiscal year. That \$73 million increase included only 5 new sworn deputies for the unincorporated areas of the county.
- ITEM: "Estimated" costs for the proposed courthouse run as high as \$600 million. The One America Plaza Tower (deluxe office tower), the Koll Center (deluxe office tower) and the Emerald Shapery Center (deluxe office tower & hotel) together cost about \$325 million. That is \$275 million less than the estimated courthouse cost. Does this seem reasonable?
- ITEM: Many cities, despite having larger municipal budgets have not increased the number of sworn law enforcement officers. Some cities have actually cut police staffing. Shouldn't budget priorities be changed before increasing taxes?
- ITEM: There is funding in the current county budget for a communications facility. Shouldn't this facility be put on-line before a new "communications complex" (estimated cost \$50 million) is built?
- ITEM: The estimated cost for the East Mesa Phase II jail is \$50 million. This could be funded from current revenues, if the Supervisors set appropriate priorities.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

Tell elected officials you want more cops, courts and jails, not more taxes.

IRBY R. McMICHAEL
President, San Diego County
Taxpayers Association

DICK RIDER
Chairman Emeritus
San Diego Libertarian Party

DIANNE JACOB
Board Member, San Diego County
Taxpayers Association

MARVIN SIMKIN
Chair
San Diego Libertarian Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON THIS PROPOSED SALES TAX INCREASE

This proposition is badly flawed for a number of reasons.

First, there is no specific price tag on the cost of the proposed courts, jails and other facilities. This measure would give the County Board of Supervisors a virtual "blank check" to spend huge amounts of your tax dollars. Because there is no sunset provision, the Board of Supervisors could spend practically any amount for the proposed facilities.

Second, 25% of the proposed tax would go to operating the new and existing county criminal justice facilities. This would allow the Board of Supervisors to freeze current spending for existing criminal justice facilities, and allocate future increases in current revenues to other bureaucratic purposes. In essence, this amounts to a huge permanent tax increase for non criminal justice related activities. The county needs to address its budget priorities in a forthright manner, not engage in political slight of hand.

Third, 25% of the proposed tax increase would go to "local law enforcement and crime prevention activities and projects". This vague wording means that this permanent tax increase could go to virtually any bureaucratic purpose, not specifically to improved police protection. And again, existing police and criminal justice expenditures in the county and in the eighteen cities could actually be frozen. The new tax could merely be substituted for future police expenditures.

There is a legitimate need for more courts, jails and police in San Diego County, but this proposition is not the way to address that need. It will raise taxes unnecessarily, and inevitably lead to unwarranted bureaucratic growth.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "A"

IRBY R. McMICHAEL, President
San Diego County Taxpayers Association

DIANNE JACOB, Board Member
San Diego County Taxpayers Association

DICK RIDER
Chairman Emeritus
San Diego Libertarian Party

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

BUILDING NEW JAILS. HIRING PEACE OFFICERS.
VOTING "YES" ON PROPOSITION A GUARANTEES BETTER PROTECTION
AND A TAX REDUCTION ONCE THE JOB IS DONE!

Public safety costs have outstripped County resources. The County cannot keep cutting services for seniors or children, or closing more parks to operate jails.

PROPOSITION A lets you say which projects to build. Your vote guarantees 4,000 new jail beds, more peace officers, and better courts.

PROPOSITION A is for criminal justice purposes and cannot be diverted to anything else.

PROPOSITION A will automatically be reduced once the needed projects are built. Your vote guarantees a tax break while criminals get a tough break.

PROPOSITION A insures correct spending priorities: YOUR SAFETY FIRST. Your vote guarantees every dollar must be spent on protecting you, your family and neighborhood. At last, you can tell government what to do, not the other way around.

PROPOSITION A will help operate the facilities it builds. Any other course is irresponsible.

PROPOSITION A is the only way a struggling County can protect you. With the County cutting needed services in a fiscal crisis, PROPOSITION A guarantees enough funds will be available to meet the criminal crisis.

Freedom isn't free; neither is improved public safety. If ever there was a "good" tax, PROPOSITION A is it. And a 1/2 cent sales tax is a small price to accomplish so much.

VOTE "YES" FOR YOUR OWN SAFETY
VOTE "YES" TO PUT CRIMINALS BEHIND BARS
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION A - STOP CRIME TODAY

ROBERT JEAN LICHTER
Past President
San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Chairman, San Diegans, Inc.

BARRY I. NEWMAN
Past President
San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Chairman, County Finance Review Panel

DAVID NUFFER
Chair Elect, Greater San Diego
Chamber of Commerce

ARTHUR M. ARONSON, M.D.
Director and Chairman
Victims Action League

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO Proposition B

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

PROP B PROPOSED "JUST SAY NO" AMENDMENT TO THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER LIMITING THE VALIDITY OF ANY PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS IMPOSING MANDATORY COSTS. Shall the San Diego County Charter be amended by adding Section 805 to the Charter which would require that for any proposed Charter amendment imposing mandatory costs to be valid, the proposed Charter amendment must be accompanied by a new and legally available funding source?

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be added are underlined.

IT IS PROPOSED that Section 805 be added to the San Diego County Charter to read as follows:

Section 805: Limitation on Charter Amendments Imposing Mandatory Costs.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Charter, except as provided in subdivision (c) of this section, any amendment to the Charter of the County of San Diego taking effect on or after November 3, 1992 imposing any mandatory service, duty or cost on the County shall be effective only if such amendment is accompanied at the same time by a new, specific and legally available source of revenue to fully fund all costs created by such amendment for each and every year.

(b) In the event full funding of any amendment is not provided as required by subdivision (a), the mandate shall be void and unenforceable.

(c) The restrictions provided in subdivision (a) shall not apply to any amendment to the Charter of the County of San Diego which is approved by a two-thirds vote of the qualified electors of the County of San Diego.

(d) If any section, part, clause or phrase of this amendment is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining portion shall not be affected but shall remain in full force and effect.

(e) It is the intent of the voters that the provisions of this section shall apply to any proposed amendment to the Charter of the County of San Diego submitted to the voters at the election to be held on November 3, 1992 or thereafter.

COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS

This proposition, submitted to the voters by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego, would add section 805 to the San Diego County Charter to require that any amendment of the San Diego County Charter taking effect on or after November 3, 1992 which imposes any mandatory service, duty or cost on the County shall be effective only if such amendment is accompanied at the same time by a new, specific and legally available source of revenue to fully fund all costs created by the amendment for each and every year. The proposition provides that in the event full funding is not provided, the mandate shall be void and unenforceable unless it has been approved by a two-thirds vote of the qualified electors of the County of San Diego. The proposition expresses the intent of the voters that its provisions shall apply to any proposed amendment to the San Diego County Charter which is submitted to the voters at the election to be held on November 3, 1992 or thereafter.

A "Yes" vote on the proposition is a vote to add section 805 to the San Diego County Charter.

A "No" vote on the proposition is a vote against adding section 805 to the San Diego County Charter.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B

- The Federal government's air regulations are forcing us to give up our cars even when we have no alternatives!
- The State government forces us to give welfare to able bodied adults!
- Now, a local employee group wants to force the County to hire more public employees!

It's time to just say "NO" to special interest groups that are trying to use the ballot box to add new programs and public employees without providing money to pay for them.

San Diego county government is facing the threat of new mandates at a time when funds are not available to pay for existing services. Jobs are being eliminated and employees are taking time off without pay.

The County Board of Supervisors must try to allocate inadequate resources to fund services such as law enforcement, libraries, senior services, parks, and drug and anti-gang programs. These services will be threatened if new services are mandated without a means to pay for them.

Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will tell special interest groups and public employee organizations to either compete fairly during budget hearings with other county services or provide new money for their proposed new service. Your YES vote on PROPOSITION B will also protect the services you expect from your county government.

GEORGE F. BAILEY
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

BRIAN P. BILBRAY
County Supervisor

ROGER W. CHALLBERG
President, San Diego Parks Society

MARGARET J. HELTON, R.N.
Area Agency on Aging
Advisory Council

BARRY I. NEWMAN
Chairman, County Finance Review Panel

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

- Do you think that action by the Board of Supervisors will be able to tell the Federal Government "No" to air standards?
- Do you want to lose your ability to regulate local government through the initiative process?
- Do you want to lose your ability to regulate spending by the Board of Supervisors?
- Do you want to waste your precious tax dollars on an issue that some board members have already said is illegal?

This initiative, sponsored by the Board of Supervisors, seeks to remove your control and input into local government. The Board of Supervisors can't even understand their own budget, and now they want you to do their job if you feel an item is important. This is an important measure for the Board of Supervisors so they can maintain control of their pet projects.

Don't give up your rights as a voter and citizen! VOTE NO ON PROP B!

RANDALL DIBB
President, Deputy Sheriffs' Association
of San Diego County

PAMELA C. SLATER
City Councilmember

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The Board of Supervisors voted to place Proposition B on the ballot. This follows the placement of other issues on the ballot in which a sufficient number of signatures were gathered from you, the citizens of San Diego County.

The Board of Supervisors is attempting to place regulations on any measure that comes before them in the future. This simply means that if you, as a citizen, place an item on the ballot, you must do the Board of Supervisors' job and analyze the massive county budget.

We have already heard the Board of Supervisors say that this measure may not even be lawful. Do you want to waste precious tax dollars to attempt to unsuccessfully defend this measure in the courts?

Members of the Board of Supervisors were elected to their position by choice. They chose to be elected and their job is to regulate the budget for the County of San Diego. This includes any mandates that you, the voters, may decide are important enough, including maintaining certain levels of service. **We set the priorities;** they administer the budget.

No one believes that we should further waste our limited tax dollars on such a foolish measure as Proposition B. A "No" vote will mean that your tax dollars are not wasted on fights with local, state and federal governments.

DEPUTY SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY
RANDALL DIBB, President

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Proposition B's only opposition is from the same public employee group that is trying in the courts to **destroy the voter approved** Citizens Law Enforcement Review Board. Now they are threatening to use lawyers and the courts to sue if you approve Proposition B!

Aren't you sick and tired of special interest groups that sue when they don't get their way?

Proposition B is simple and will cost you nothing.

It tells special interest groups (**most of whom use paid signature gatherers to get their special interest legislation on the ballot**) that their proposition will only be valid if it contains "a new, specific and legally available source of revenue to fully fund all costs created by such amendment for each and every year."

Please vote YES ON PROPOSITION B to preserve **YOUR RIGHT** to demand that the Board of Supervisors fund the services you expect such as law enforcement, senior services, libraries, parks, and drug and anti-gang programs.

Don't allow a well funded public employee group to monopolize the budget before **YOU** even have a chance to tell the Board of Supervisors what your priorities are.

PROPOSITION B IS GOOD MANAGEMENT. Simply said, give us no mandated program without the money to pay for them. A YES on Proposition B is a strong action to prevent special interest groups from unfairly gaining support for a particular program to the detriment of other vital County services.

YES ON B

BRIAN P. BILBRAY
Supervisor, District One

GEORGE F. BAILEY
Supervisor, District Two

ROGER W. CHALLBERG
President, San Diego Parks Society

MARGARET J. HELTON, R.N.
Member, Area Agency on Aging

BARRY I. NEWMAN
Chairman, County Finance Review Panel

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition C

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

PROP C PROPOSED INITIATIVE MEASURE AMENDING THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHARTER TO PROVIDE FOR MINIMUM STAFFING FOR THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. Shall Section 605 of the San Diego County Charter be amended which (1) would impose a mandatory requirement on the County Board of Supervisors to allocate sufficient funds to employ minimum numbers of deputy sheriffs based upon the number of inhabitants of the unincorporated areas of the County and minimum numbers of correctional deputy sheriffs based upon the number of inmates in the Sheriff detention facilities, and (2) would impose a mandatory requirement on the Sheriff to appoint, direct and supervise such minimum numbers of deputy sheriffs and correctional deputy sheriffs?

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be added are underlined.

IT IS PROPOSED that Section 605 of the San Diego County Charter be amended to read:

Section 605: Sheriff. The Sheriff shall organize the Sheriff's Department for efficient and effective law enforcement.

The San Diego Sheriff's Department shall consist of an elected Sheriff and such deputies, members and employees as the San Diego County Board of Supervisors may from time to time prescribe by ordinance.

A number of sworn deputy sheriffs and/or correctional deputy sheriffs to provide patrol, investigative and detentions services and the administrative support related thereto shall be allocated sufficient funds for employment by an ordinance adopted by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, shall be approved for appointment by the Chief Administrative Officer and shall be appointed, directed and supervised by the San Diego County Sheriff. The number of deputy sheriffs shall on the dates specified, be equal to or greater than the number specified for each 1,000 inhabitants of the unincorporated areas of San Diego County as such population is determined by the census of inhabitants as published by the San Diego Association of Governments and in the case of sworn Sheriff's correctional staff be equal to or greater than the number specified per a census of the Sheriff's detention facility inmates taken on July 1 of the year prior to the new ratios taking effect, as follows: by January 1, 1994, 1.50 deputy sheriffs per 1,000 inhabitants and 0.20 sworn Sheriff's correctional staff per Sheriff's detention facility inmate; by January 1, 1995, 1.75 deputy sheriffs per 1,000 inhabitants and 0.22 sworn Sheriff's correctional staff per Sheriff's detention facility inmate; by January 1, 1996, 2.00 deputy sheriffs per 1,000 inhabitants and 0.24 sworn Sheriff's correctional staff per Sheriff's detention facility inmate; by January 1, 1997 and thereafter at least 2.25 deputy sheriffs per 1,000 inhabitants and 0.25 sworn Sheriff's correctional staff per Sheriff's detention facility inmate.

COUNTY COUNSEL'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS

Existing provisions of the San Diego County Charter and state law provide that the Board of Supervisors, as the elective legislative body of the County of San Diego, shall fix the number of nonelective employees and prepare and adopt the County budget, based on available revenues and the needs of the County. This initiative measure, if approved by the voters, would amend section 605 of the San Diego County Charter to require the Board of Supervisors to appropriate sufficient funds to employ a minimum number of sworn deputy sheriffs and sworn correctional staff to provide patrol, investigation and detention services for the Sheriff's Department without regard to available resources and prior to the funding of other County services. This appropriation is based on the following separate formulas:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Minimum Number of Sworn Deputy Sheriffs*</u>	<u>Minimum Number of Sworn Correctional Staff**</u>
January 1, 1994	1.50	0.20
January 1, 1995	1.75	0.22
January 1, 1996	2.00	0.24
January 1, 1997 and thereafter	2.25	0.25

* per 1000 inhabitants of the unincorporated area of the County

** per inmate in detention facilities under jurisdiction of the Sheriff

Thus, the initiative measure establishes separate minimum staffing requirements on a department-wide basis for (1) sworn deputy sheriffs to provide patrol and investigative services and administrative support, based on the population in the unincorporated area of the County on designated dates and (2) sworn correctional staff to provide detention services, and administrative support, based on the inmate population on designated dates in detention facilities under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff.

Although not expressly defined, the terms "sworn deputy sheriff" and "sworn correctional staff", as used in the context of the initiative measure, would include all the various classifications of sworn persons employed by the County of San Diego within the Sheriff's Department to provide patrol, investigation and detention services, except the Under-Sheriff and Assistant Sheriffs which the Charter specifically limits to one and three positions respectively.

Existing law gives the Sheriff discretion to make the appointments to fill positions authorized by the Board of Supervisors. This initiative measure would require the Sheriff to make the appointments of the minimum staffing levels established by the initiative measure.

A "Yes" vote on the initiative measure is a vote to adopt the amendment to section 605 of the San Diego County Charter requiring the County of San Diego to provide defined required minimum staffing levels for the San Diego County Sheriff's Department.

A "No" vote on the initiative measure is a vote against requiring the County of San Diego to provide defined required minimum staffing levels for the San Diego County Sheriff's Department.

AUDITOR AND CONTROLLER'S IMPARTIAL FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This is an impartial fiscal analysis of this initiative which would establish minimum staffing for the County of San Diego Sheriff's Department. The language of the initiative is imprecise and ambiguous in laying a foundation for a precise analysis of its impact on the County's revenues and expenditures. If it is approved by the voters, the imprecision of the initiative language may lead to judicial challenges to the administrative actions to implement the provisions of the initiative. The subsequent results of the judicial process may lead to interpretations that could significantly affect the actual fiscal impact of the initiative.

This analysis presumes that the Sheriff's Department would continue its current maintenance of effort, support and organizational configuration. Therefore, based on the fiscal year 1992/93 budget if the provisions of this initiative were in effect now, the estimated fiscal impact on revenues and expenditures would be to increase annual direct and support costs of the Sheriff's Department by \$17,859,000 with revenues unaffected. The projected cumulative future cost under this same maintenance of effort and organizational configuration would be \$153,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 1997/98.

The future costs are projected based on the following key assumptions:

1. When establishing the ratio of Deputy Sheriffs to 1,000 residents, the term Deputy Sheriff is in accordance with County Counsel's impartial analysis that appears in this booklet.
2. Unincorporated population and inmate population have been held constant in this analysis. Increases or decreases to these population groups would effect the fiscal impact accordingly.
3. No inflation factor has been built into this analysis. Inflation or deflation during this period will increase or decrease the fiscal impact accordingly.

This analysis does not take into account the effect on the Courts, Marshal, District Attorney, Public Defender and Probation if the Initiative is approved by the voters.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Crime at Record Levels and Climbing!

Burglary, gang shootings and homicides
continue to increase!

Since 1985, violent crime is up 70%

But that is more than twice as fast as deputies were hired for the unincorporated areas.

Are we losing to the criminals?

The County built the new East Mesa Jail but wouldn't staff it for over a year. Its 1,500 jail beds sat empty while almost 700,000 warrants went unserved. Violent criminals are released early to ease jail overcrowding.

Are we losing to the criminals?

From a County budget of \$1.9 BILLION, County bureaucrats and politicians claim they can't hire at least 2.25 deputies to serve each thousand unincorporated residents? In two years, County salaries and benefits have grown \$142 million but there's no money to open new jails?

Or, are we really losing to the politicians and bureaucrats!

The "S.A.F.E. County Minimum Staffing Measure" makes the bureaucrats put your safety first.

Makes them reprioritize the massive county budget.

Gives them until 1994 to reasonably adjust budgets.

Then, it gives them until 1997 to meet the minimum standards!

THAT'S WHY PROPOSITION C DOES NOT RAISE TAXES. Existing revenue, if properly and efficiently spent, can hire every deputy needed.

EXPECT WILD INTERPRETATIONS AND PREDICTIONS OF DISASTER!

DON'T BE FOOLED!

PUT THE SAFETY OF YOU AND YOUR FAMILY FIRST!

A YES VOTE on Proposition C turns the tide against the criminals. A YES VOTE means spending existing taxes properly. A YES VOTE means:

- No tax increases!
- Better use of existing revenues!
- Jails opened and properly staffed!
- Homicide investigators to close the 150 unsolved murders sitting in file cabinets!
- Patrol deputies to catch the 12,700 crooks who broke into your homes, stole your cars, or held you up at gunpoint last year!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C!

MAKE YOUR COUNTY S.A.F.E. ONCE AGAIN

RANDALL DIBB
Deputy Sheriffs' Association President

DANIEL P. SULLIVAN
Parents of Murdered Children

E. F. "SKIP" MURPHY
President, San Diego and
Imperial Chapter PORAC

DIANNE JACOB
Member, Jamul-Dulzura School Board

EDWARD B. MEYER
Foreman, County Grand Jury (1986-1987)

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

KNOW WHAT YOU ARE VOTING FOR !

FIGHTING CRIME THROUGHOUT THE REGION IS THE BOARD'S TOP PRIORITY!

- Over the last five years the County has put \$.75 from every additional \$1.00 of general revenue into the criminal justice system.
- 482 Deputy Sheriffs have been added in five years.
- Over the last eleven years the Board of Supervisors has increased the Sheriff's budget by \$98 million dollars.
- The new East Mesa Jail will be fully operational in January. The delay was due to cuts in State funding.

WHERE WILL THE MONEY COME FROM TO PAY FOR PROPOSITION C?

- **CUTS WILL HAVE TO BE MADE** in prevention programs, medical assistance to children and babies, senior services, parks and libraries----and other parts of the criminal justice system like Courts, the District Attorney and Probation.
- 95% of the County budget is mandated by the federal and state governments.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY INFLATED AND INACCURATE STATISTICS:

- If you live in one of San Diego's 18 cities, Proposition C will do absolutely nothing for you. Cities will not have more police. Your tax dollars will go elsewhere.
- The driving force behind the growth in salaries and benefits has been the lobbying and negotiation efforts in Sacramento of employee groups like the Deputy Sheriff's Association to drive up the cost of government services.
- Data indicates that there is no guarantee that adding more police will reduce crime:

	CRIME RATE	OFFICERS PER THOUSAND
CHICAGO	110.6	4.3
PHOENIX	107.6	2.0

HELP PROVIDE RESPONSIBLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

BRIAN P. BILBRAY
County Supervisor

EDWARD T. BUTLER
Justice, Court of Appeals (Retired)

LEON L. WILLIAMS
County Supervisor

MARK NELSON
Past President,
San Diego County Taxpayers Association
Member, County Finance Review Panel

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We all know that San Diego County's financial problems are at crisis level. Adding new requirements without any way to pay for them makes no sense.

The Board of Supervisors supports adequate law enforcement staffing. Law enforcement has always been our #1 priority. Over the past 11 years, the Sheriff's budget has increased by more than \$98 million dollars and 1,168 new employees. The County has nearly doubled the inmate capacity since 1985.

Locking in artificial, rigid requirements with no funding source is the wrong approach. Adding new requirements without a funding source means that we would face cuts in other important services such as medical assistance to children and families, libraries, parks and anti-gang and drug programs.

Proposition C will require almost twice as many correctional officers as needed at new "state of the art," staff efficient jails such as East Mesa. Locking in mandatory staff levels for our jails will arbitrarily limit our ability to continue to add jail capacity and get criminals off our streets.

Opposing this measure is consistent with the County's "Just Say No" position on all unfunded mandates. Let's not create an even worse problem at the local level!

NO ON PROPOSITION C

BRIAN P. BILBRAY
County Supervisor

LEON L. WILLIAMS
County Supervisor

REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

**OVER 108,000 SAN DIEGANS SIGNED THIS INITIATIVE
TELLING THE POLITICIANS: "OUR SAFETY COMES FIRST"**

FROM A \$1.9 BILLION BUDGET WITH 50% WELFARE FRAUD, WHY CAN'T WE HIRE ENOUGH DEPUTIES TO PROTECT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD OR OPEN OUR JAILS?

The two politicians who signed the argument against Proposition C won't explain why the Grand Jury documented over \$70 MILLION in welfare fraud last year. We estimate the first year the S.A.F.E. County Minimum Staffing Measure cost will be just over \$7 million. Who says the County cannot afford minimum public protection?

WHO DO YOU TRUST MORE:

- THE PEACE OFFICERS RISKING THEIR LIVES EACH DAY TO PROTECT YOU AND YOUR FAMILY, or
- THE POLITICIANS AND BUREAUCRATS OPPOSING THIS MEASURE?

Is law enforcement really a County priority? Court documents show San Diego is ranked 56th out of 58 counties in per capita spending for law enforcement. Most spending increases go for the care and feeding of inmates, not for catching neighborhood crooks.

IF LAW ENFORCEMENT WAS TRULY A PRIORITY, WOULD THIS INITIATIVE HAVE BEEN NECESSARY?

When government does not work, the citizens must take charge. The Minimum Staffing Measure forces the Board of Supervisors to control crime; putting peace officers to work protecting you! Urgent calls will be answered, burglars caught, and car thieves brought to justice. Our jails will become operational. The 150 unsolved homicides will be properly investigated.

**YOUR MOST IMPORTANT VOTE IN 1992!!
THIS VOTE MAKES YOUR SAFETY THE FIRST PRIORITY
FOR A S.A.F.E. COUNTY, VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C!**

GAIL HANO
Council Member

PAMELA C. SLATER
City Council Member

DIANNE JACOB
Member, Jamul-Dulzura School Board

RANDALL DIBB
President, Deputy Sheriffs' Association
of San Diego County

THOMAS W. REESE
Member of California Senior Legislature

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition D

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

PROP D AMENDS SECTION 103 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO AND AMENDS ORDINANCE NOS. 10465 AND 10466, OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO PERTAINING TO FRANCHISES GRANTED TO SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY. Amends Section 103 of the Charter of the City of San Diego, and the gas and electric franchises currently held by San Diego Gas & Electric Company, to provide that a transfer of the franchise is required to be approved by the City Council when there is any change in the legal structure of the franchise holder which alters the ownership or control of the franchise holder. Changes in legal structure are defined to include, but not necessarily be limited to, sale, lease, assignment, corporate merger, stock swap, leveraged buy-out reorganization or any other method which changes the ownership or control of the franchise holder. These amendments are intended to be declaratory in nature as a clarification of existing transfer provisions in the Charter and in the various City franchises presently in existence.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be added are underlined.

Amends Ordinances Nos. 10465 and 10466 pertaining to City's Franchise granted to SDG&E and amends Section 103 (Franchises) of Article VII (Finance) of the Charter of The City of San Diego to read as follows:

Sections 15 and 16 of the franchises awarded by Ordinance Nos. 10465 and 10466, respectively, are amended to add the following:

For purposes of this section, City Council consent to transfer shall be required when there is any change in the legal structure of Grantee which alters the ownership or control of Grantee. Such change shall include, but not be necessarily limited to, sale, lease, assignment, corporate merger, stock swap, leveraged buy-out, reorganization or any other method heretofore or hereafter devised which results in a change of ownership or control of Grantee. Without City Council consent as provided in Section 103 of the City Charter as it now exists or may exist in the future, this franchise shall not be deemed to be transferred. This amendment is intended to be declaratory in nature as a clarification of this existing transfer provision;


and

City Charter section 103 is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 103. FRANCHISES.

The Council shall have power to grant to any person, firm or corporation, franchises, and all renewals, extensions and amendments thereof, for the use of any public property under the jurisdiction of the City. Such grants shall be made by ordinance adopted by vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members of the Council and only after recommendations thereon have been made by the Manager and an opportunity for free and open competition and for public hearings have been given. No ordinance granting a franchise or a renewal,

extension or amendment of an existing franchise shall be effective until thirty days after its passage, during which time it shall be subject to the referendum provisions of this Charter. No franchises shall be transferable except with the approval of the Council expressed by ordinance. For purposes of this section, a Council approved transfer shall be required when there is any change in the legal structure of the entity which holds the franchise, which change alters the ownership or control of the entity. Such changes include, but are not necessarily limited to, sale, lease, assignment, corporate merger, stock swap, leveraged buyout, reorganization, or any other method heretofore or hereafter devised which results in a change of ownership or control of the entity. Absent Council approval, the franchise shall not be deemed to have been transferred to the new entity. This amendment is intended to be declaratory in nature as an explanation of the existing transfer of franchise provisions as set forth above and in the various City franchises presently in existence.



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

SAVE SAN DIEGO JOBS

SAVE SAN DIEGO'S LOCALLY RUN UTILITY

AND SAVE YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

LAST YEAR, THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO ALMOST LOST SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO LOS ANGELES BASED SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON IN A HOSTILE TAKEOVER BID.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON SPENT OVER \$100 MILLION IN AN ATTEMPT TO FORCE THE TAKEOVER. THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO SPENT NEARLY \$7 MILLION FIGHTING BACK AND WON.

THIS FIGHT COULD HAPPEN AGAIN, UNLESS YOU VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

STOP FUTURE TAKEOVERS OF SAN DIEGO'S UTILITIES.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

PROPOSITION D OFFERS STRONGER CHARTER LANGUAGE AND STRONGER CHARTER PROTECTION TO PREVENT ANY UNWANTED FUTURE TAKEOVERS OF SAN DIEGO'S UTILITIES.

PROTECT SAN DIEGO'S JOBS

PROTECT SAN DIEGO'S LOCALLY BASED UTILITIES
FROM OUTSIDE TAKEOVER
AND PROTECT YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE ON THE ISSUE

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

PROPOSITION D PROTECTS ALL OF US AND PROTECTS SAN DIEGO'S JOBS AND SAN DIEGO'S FUTURE.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY PROMISES OF LOWER UTILITY RATES OR BETTER STOCK PRICES, THEY WON'T HAPPEN, WE WILL ONLY LOSE JOBS.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D

THANK YOU

MAUREEN F. O'CONNOR
Mayor, City of San Diego

MICHAEL SHAMES
Executive Director, UCAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

GOVERNMENT FLAPDOODLE - ANOTHER HUMONGOUS EXAMPLE OF WASTE

This proposition is just another way for the City of San Diego to waste money. The City has already spent over \$6,300,000.00 of your tax dollars on this issue. For what purpose, Ego?

Both the California Constitution and the California Legislature require the Public Utilities Commission to regulate public utilities in California.

Before a public utility can acquire the stock of another public utility it must first obtain permission from the PUC.

Regulations, Regulations, Regulations! Now the City wants to add its 2 cents by adding even more regulations. Talk about overkill! Regulations equal higher costs to you the consumer.

Under existing law a public utility cannot sell, lease, assign, mortgage or otherwise dispose of its property and may not merge its property with any other public utility without first obtaining permission from the PUC.

The State Corporations Commission, the Secretary of State, the Securities & Exchange Commission, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission also regulate mergers between public utilities, including SDG&E.

All this costs money! Your money! The costs are added to your utility bills or added to your taxes collected by the City. Isn't it time to just say no to the City on stupid and needlessly higher taxes?

In 1980 SDG&E had the highest utility bills in California. Today, SDG&E has the lowest rates in California and 32nd lowest nationwide. SDG&E continues to find every possible way of lowering your bills at a time when every level of government is trying to raise your taxes and blame the raise on someone else - just look at how the City has been raising your water and sewer bills. Tell the City to clean up its own house first and-

JUST SAY NO TO PROPOSITION D

FRED SCHNAUBELT
Former San Diego City Councilman
Taxpayers' Representative

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition E

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

PROP E **AMENDS SECTIONS 10 AND 12 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.** Amends Charter section 10 to require that commencing with the year 1996, the municipal primary elections to the office of Council member for districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year. Commencing with the year 1998, the municipal primary elections to the offices of Council member for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year.

Amends Charter Section 12 to provide that, at the municipal primary and general elections in 1993, Council members for districts, 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3) years. Provides that Council members for districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter. Provides that, at the municipal primary and general election in 1995, Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6 and 8 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3) years. Provides that, Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be deleted are printed in ~~strike-out~~ type and the portions to be added are underlined.

Amends Sections 10 and 12 of the Charter of The City of San Diego to read as follows:

SECTION 10. ELECTIONS.

Elective officers of the City shall be nominated and elected by all of the electors of the City except that City Council members other than the Mayor shall be nominated and elected by the electors of the district for which elective office they are a candidate.

~~The regular municipal primary election shall be held on the third Tuesday in September in each odd numbered year, and the general municipal election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of the same year, or, if either of these days falls on a legal holiday, then the election shall be held on the next succeeding day which is not a legal holiday; provided, however that~~ Commencing with the year 1996, the municipal primary elections to the office of Council member for Districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be held on same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year. Commencing with the year 1998, the municipal primary elections to the offices of Council member for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year.

Commencing with the year 1984 the elections to the offices of Mayor and City Attorney shall be held every four (4) years. The municipal primary election for ~~these~~ the offices of Mayor and City Attorney shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same day as the California State general election for that year. All other municipal elections which may be held under this charter shall be known as special municipal elections.

All elective officers of the City shall be nominated at the municipal primary election. In the event one candidate receives the majority of votes cast for all candidates for nomination to a particular elective office, the candidate so receiving such majority of votes shall be deemed to be and declared by the Council to be elected to such office. In the event no candidate receives a majority of votes cast as aforesaid, the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for a particular elective office at said primary shall be the candidates, and only candidates, for such office and the names of only those two candidates shall be printed upon the ballots to be used at the general municipal election.

At the general municipal election held for the purpose of electing Council members other than the Mayor the electors of each Council district shall select from among the candidates chosen at the primary election in that district one candidate for the office of the Council member whose term expires the succeeding December. At the general municipal election held for the purpose of electing any other elective officer there shall be chosen by all of the electors of the whole City from among the candidates chosen at the primary one candidate to succeed any other elective officer whose term expires in December succeeding the election.

After the result of an election for any office is declared, or when an appointment is made, the City Clerk, under his hand and official seal, shall issue a certificate therefor, and shall deliver the same immediately to the person elected or appointed, and such person must within ten days after receiving such certificate file his official bond, if one be required for his office, and take and subscribe to the oath of office required of him by this Charter, which oath must be filed with the City Clerk.

SECTION 12. THE COUNCIL.

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

At the municipal primary and general election in 1979, a Mayor shall be chosen by the electors for a term of five (5) years. A Mayor shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter. The Mayor shall hold office for the term prescribed from and after 10 a.m. the first Monday after the first day of December next succeeding the election and until a successor is elected and qualified.

At the municipal primary and general elections in 1993, Council members for Districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3)

years. Council members for Districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter.

At the municipal primary and general election in 1995, Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall be chosen by the electors for a term of three (3) years. Council members for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall thereafter be elected for a term of four (4) years in the manner prescribed by Section 10 of this Charter.

~~Except as provided in this Section, Council members, other than the Mayor, shall be elected at either the municipal primary or the general municipal election held in the odd numbered years and, except as hereinafter provided, shall hold office for the term of four (4) years from and after 10 a.m. the first Monday after the first day of December next succeeding their election and until their successors are elected and qualified.~~

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Charter and commencing with elections held in 1992, no person shall serve more than two consecutive four-year terms as a Council member from any particular district. If for any reason a person serves a partial term as Council member from a particular district in excess of two (2) years, that partial term shall be considered a full term for purposes of this term limit provision. Persons holding office prior to the November 1992 election shall not have prior or current terms be counted for the purpose of applying this term limit provision to future elections.


Upon any redistricting pursuant to the provisions of this Charter, incumbent Council members will continue to represent the district in which they reside, unless as a result of such redistricting more than one incumbent Council member resides within any one district, in which case the City Council may determine by lot which Council member shall represent each district. At the next municipal primary and general elections following a redistricting, Council members shall be elected from those districts not represented and from those districts represented by incumbent Council members whose terms expire as of the general election in said year. If as a result of any redistricting more than a simple majority of the City Council as redistricted shall be elected at either the municipal primary or general election next following any such redistricting, the City Council prior to any such election shall designate one or more new districts for which the initial councilmanic term shall be two (2) years in order to retain staggered terms for Council members.

Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, in the event a vacancy occurs for any reason in the office of a Council District, the Council shall immediately cause an election to be held to fill such vacancy solely in the district in which the vacancy occurred. Such election shall be conducted within ninety (90) days of the vacancy. The candidate receiving the greatest number of votes shall be deemed to be and declared by the Council to be elected to the vacant office. If, however, a vacancy occurs for any reason in the office of a Council District within 100 days of an upcoming regular municipal election, the Council may in its discretion forgo the election process and fill the vacancy by appointment. Any person who fills the vacancy shall hold office only until the next regular municipal election, at which time a person shall be elected under the provisions of Section 10 of this Charter to serve for the remainder, if any, of the unexpired term.

It is the duty of the Council members to attend all Council meetings. The Council shall vacate the seat of any Council member who is absent from eight (8) consecutive meetings or fifty percent (50%) of any scheduled meetings within a month unless the absence thereof is excused by resolution of the Council.

Council members, including the Mayor, shall devote full time to the duties of their office and not engage in any outside employment, trade, business or profession which interferes or conflicts with those duties.

Council members shall not be eligible during the term for which they were appointed or elected to hold any other office or employment with the City, except as Mayor or City Attorney and as a member of any Board, Commission or Committee thereof, of which they are constituted such a member by general law or by this Charter.



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Save the Charter! Vote No on Proposition E!

San Diego's City Charter put odd-year elections into the City Charter in order to:

- Have elections only on municipal issues.
- Keep Party politics out of City elections.
- Make sure Council members face the voters without the protection of even-year big ballots.

Why change?

The other side says changing will save money. NO! If even one City-wide special election has to be called in an odd year it will cost \$800,000. All the so-called savings for half a decade will be wiped out. If there have to be District elections in off-years, MONEY IS SPENT! And already there has to be at least one district election in 1993. PHONY SAVINGS!!!

In the past four years five incumbents have been removed! Would they have been thrown out if they had the protection of a massive ballot and party politics? NO!

- There will be less attention on City issues by putting City elections in the same elections as the President, the Governor and all State and Congressional races.
- Incumbents will be protected! Challengers can't spotlight the incumbents and spotlight City issues!
- Challengers will have trouble raising volunteers and money unless they join with the Party politicians! Do you want Party politics in City election? NO! NO! NO!

Nine out of 10 of the largest cities in America – even New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles – hold their elections in the odd-years. WHY? To have elections only on local issues and with local candidates.

Don't give the incumbents the protection they want!

Don't give the incumbents the power of Party politics!

Don't give incumbents the chance to hide.

Save money and Vote NO on incumbent protection! Vote NO on party politics!

Vote NO on Proposition E.

JUDY McCARTY
San Diego City Councilmember

DICK DALEKE
Assembly Candidate, 76th District

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Proposition F**

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

PROP F AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO BY AMENDING SECTION 55. Amends Section 55 of the City Charter by deleting existing language which authorizes the City Council, without a vote of the people, to establish streets and highways through dedicated public parks. Language is added to Charter Section 55 to require an annual review by the City Council of all property owned by the City which may be suitable for park dedication, and requires such dedication where the Council does not find that dedication is contrary to the public interest. Language is also added which allows the City Council by a two-thirds vote to authorize the realignment or widening of existing streets in dedicated parks. Specific language is added to require a majority vote of the qualified electors of the City voting at an election in order to establish new non-park roads through dedicated public parks. The words "or later ratified" are also stricken from the existing language to preclude the City Council's authorization of a non-park use of dedicated park land prior to voter authorization.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be deleted are printed in ~~strike-out~~ type and the portions to be added are underlined.

Amends Section 55 of the Charter of The City of San Diego to read as follows:

SECTION 55. PARK AND RECREATION

The City Manager shall have the control and management of parks, open space, parkways, plazas, beaches, cemeteries, street trees, landscaping of City-owned property, golf courses, playgrounds, recreation centers, recreation camps and recreation activities held on any City playgrounds, parks, beaches and piers, which may be owned, controlled or operated by the City. The City Council shall by ordinance adopt regulations for the proper use and protection of said park property, cemeteries, playgrounds and recreation facilities, and provide penalties for violations thereof. The Manager is charged with the enforcement of such regulations.

All real property owned in fee by the City heretofore or hereafter formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance of the Council or by statute of the State Legislature for park, recreation or cemetery purposes shall not be used for any but park, recreation or cemetery purposes without such changed use or purpose having been first authorized ~~or later ratified~~ by a vote of two-thirds of the qualified electors of the City voting at an election for such purpose. However, real property which has been heretofore or which may hereafter be set aside without the formality of an ordinance or statute dedicating such lands for park, recreation or cemetery purposes may be used for any public purpose deemed necessary by the Council.

~~Whenever the City Manager recommends it, and the City Council finds that the public interest demands it, the City Council may, without a vote of the people, authorize the opening and maintenance of streets and highways over, through and across City fee owned land which has heretofore or hereafter been formally dedicated in perpetuity by ordinance or statute for park, recreation and cemetery purposes.~~

The City Council shall annually review the inventory of all real property owned in fee by the City which has been set aside or designated by City Council action for park and recreation purposes without being formally dedicated by ordinance to such purposes. Following such annual review, the City Council shall officially dedicate any such previously undedicated land for park and recreation purposes unless such dedication is deemed contrary to the public interest. The decision of the City Council shall be final. This provision shall not apply to lands owned by the City's Water Utility.

Whenever the City Manager recommends it, and the City Council finds that the public interest demands it, the City Council may, by a two-thirds vote of the Council, without a vote of the people, authorize the realignment or widening of existing streets through or adjacent to dedicated park land to protect the public health or safety.

The dedication, setting aside or development of new non-park roads through dedicated parks or dedicated open space shall require prior approval by a majority vote of the qualified electors of the City voting at an election for such purpose. For the purposes of this paragraph, the phrase "non-park roads" shall mean roads which serve the primary purpose of providing motor vehicular access from one boundary line of a dedicated park to an area beyond another portion of the boundary line of the dedicated park.

The City Manager shall also have charge of the management, control, preservation, regulation, improvement and embellishment of all public burial grounds and cemeteries belonging to the City, and the sale of lots therein. At least twenty percent of the net proceeds from the sale of all cemetery lots shall be deposited with the City Treasurer and be kept in a fund to be known as the Cemetery Perpetuity Fund. This fund shall be administered by the Funds Commission and shall be invested in such income-producing securities as the Funds Commission may decide. The principal of the perpetuity fund (subject to such accretion or diminution as may result from investing the same) shall not be available for meeting expenses for maintenance or upkeep of the cemeteries in any manner whatsoever. All income derived from the investment of the moneys in said perpetuity fund, together with the balance of the sale price of said lots not placed in the perpetuity fund, shall be expended in the maintenance and upkeep of the cemeteries and the perpetual care and upkeep of all graves and lots in said cemeteries; provided, however, that if in any one year such income is more than needed for the purpose of such maintenance, upkeep and perpetual care the Council may direct that the excess over and above that needed as above provided may be used for any other municipal purpose. If the income from said investments of said perpetuity fund and the balance of the sale price of said lots each year are not sufficient to maintain the cemeteries and to provide perpetual care and upkeep of all graves and lots in said cemeteries the Council shall annually appropriate from other revenues an amount sufficient to enable the City to provide perpetual care and upkeep of all graves and lots in the cemeteries.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Our parks need your help. This proposed city charter amendment eliminates a costly and unfair loophole in the current charter. And it protects our parks and open space.

Currently, the City Charter requires approval by 2/3 vote of the public for any non-park development in existing dedicated parkland. This means that no strip malls, no gas stations, no radio towers or the like can be built in a city park without public approval. Unfortunately, a loophole permits nonpark-serving roads to be built through parkland without public approval.

Over the years, the City Council has badly abused this loophole at great cost to the public. Recently, the Council wasted more than \$2.7 million and 3 years on the now defunct Jackson Drive extension through Mission Trails Regional Park. It is a road that would never have gotten as far as the drawing board had the public had its say.

Proposition F will allow you—the people—to determine when and whether non-park roads should be built through your parks.

Proposition F will also require the city to review its inventory of publicly held parkland annually. Each year the council will be required to explain to the public why it is not dedicating its designated parkland. This review adds accountability and makes it tougher for the City Council to trade away public land that is designated for park use.

Your YES vote on Proposition F will protect our parks for future generations and will eliminate costly waste of taxpayers dollars on unwanted intrusions into the parks.

RAMONA SALISBURY KILTZ
League of Women Voters San Diego

DAVID KREITZER
San Diegans for Managed Growth

EUGENE McELROY
San Diego Park & Recreation Board

JULIE HOCKING
Sierra Club

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

The proponents of Proposition F want you to believe that our parks are in imminent danger of being paved over. Nonsense!

The issue is the public's right to use our parks!

Imagine trying to spend a day in Balboa Park or Mission Bay Park with no roads to take you there. These parks are your parks!

Proposition F would severely restrict your access to some of our greatest natural resources by adding another level of needless regulation to an already bloated bureaucracy.

Proposition F would severely restrict planned public access to public parks.

The proponents want you to believe that they only want "the people to decide."

In fact, Proposition F would delay or render impossible park improvements because it's difficult for communities to mount a citywide campaign on their own behalf. Proposition F replaces democracy with City Council whimsy and politics.

Let's face it. The proponents believe people should stay out of parks. If Proposition F was around years ago we wouldn't have Balboa Park or Mission Bay Park. The costs, delays, red tape, and plain old politics would have made it impossible to build either.

Proposition F is bad government and poor planning. It overrides adopted community plans, park plans and the General Plan. These plans are written by citizens to serve citizen interests. They are the result of years of consensus building and public review. Proposition F simply fails the common sense test!

If you want to keep parks for people, if you want to keep public access to public parks, then vote NO on Proposition F.

And, if you prefer good planning to bad politics, vote NO on Proposition F.

JUDY McCARTY
San Diego City Councilmember

PHIL STAHL
Parks for People Advocate

BETTY OGILVIE
Native San Diegan

MARY M. JONES
Community Activist
MAJ Ret., U.S.A.R.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Proposition G

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

PROP G

AMENDS SECTION 66 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Establishes that San Diego Unified School District Board members shall be nominated, elected, and recalled by district rather than nominated by district and elected citywide.

Provides Notice to the Voter, as follows: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition H, which would increase the number of Board members from 5 to 7, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter section 66.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be deleted are printed in ~~strike-out~~ type and the portions to be added are underlined.

Amends Section 66 of the Charter of The City of San Diego to read as follows:

SECTION 66. BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The government of the San Diego Unified School District shall be vested in a Board of Education, composed of five members who shall be nominated and elected on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election and the California state general election in that year. Members shall be nominated and elected by the electors of the Board member trustee district for which elective office they are a candidate, at the regular municipal primary elections and the general municipal elections at the same time as the election of Council members. At the municipal primary election there shall be chosen by the registered voters of each Board of Education District two candidates for the office of any Board of Education member from a District whose term expires the succeeding December. At the general municipal election the registered voters of the whole San Diego Unified School District shall select from among the candidates chosen at the primary election in each district one candidate for the office of each Board of Education member whose term expires the succeeding December. Each candidate for the Board of Education shall have been a registered voter of the San Diego Unified School District and an actual resident of the election district from which ~~he~~ the candidate seeks to be nominated for thirty (30) calendar days immediately preceding filing of a nomination petition. The members shall serve for a term of four years from and after 10 a.m. the first Monday after the first day of December next succeeding this election and until their successors are elected and qualified, except as herein provided. Any vacancy occurring in the Board shall be filled from the election district in which the vacancy occurs by appointment by the remaining Board members; but in the event that said remaining members fail to fill such vacancy by appointment within thirty (30) calendar days after the vacancy

occurs, they must immediately cause to be held a primary election in the district in which the vacancy occurs and general election ~~within the entire school district~~ to fill such vacancy; provided, however, that any person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office only until the next regular municipal election, at which date a person shall be elected to serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

For the purpose of electing members of the Board of Education, the San Diego Unified School District shall be divided into five (5) districts as nearly equal in population as practicable. For the first primary and regular election held under this section, as amended, the boundaries of such election districts shall be established by the Board of Education as such Board existed on the effective date of the amendment to this section. Thereafter, the boundaries of such election districts shall be subject to alteration and change under the provisions of this section. The Board of Education, by resolution, may change and alter the boundaries of the election districts and in the resolution may describe the new boundaries by reference to a map on file in the office of the City Clerk; a metes and bounds description of the new boundaries need not be contained in said resolution.

Notice to the Voter: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition H, which would increase the number of Board of Education members from five to seven, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter Section 66.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District has placed a measure on the ballot to amend the City charter to change the method of electing school board members. The proposal would change the present system of citywide elections to district-only elections bringing the school board's process in line with other elected representatives in the city, county, state, and nation.

The board believes that district-only elections would serve to empower voters and result in increased voter participation. The generally recognized feelings of disenfranchisement evidenced by low-voter turnout and large blocks of non-voters for school issues suggests a need for this kind of empowerment.

With district-only elections, individual voters would have a greater impact on each district candidate. So it follows that the elected board members may be more sensitive to local district issues.

With district-only elections, voters would be much more likely to know their individual district candidates. Therefore, they would vote in a more informed way and would hold their board members more accountable.

District-only elections would be much less costly for the candidates. It would cost considerably less to campaign within one district than it would be to conduct a districtwide campaign.

ANN ARMSTRONG
President, Board of Education

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

The Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District is responsible for making policy decisions that affect the education of children throughout the entire school district. A Citizens' Advisory Committee for Reapportionment, appointed by the board and representing all communities in San Diego, recommended that the current method of electing board members continue. Through the nomination process, a community is able to select individuals to represent it. By the election in the total city, all the citizens have a choice in selecting the school board.

AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

- * Empower voters by giving them the opportunity to vote for ALL the members of the board.
- * Encourage candidates to consider the needs of the total school district by making them more responsive to all issues and all citizens.
- * Help familiarize all candidates for the board with the wide range of educational concerns throughout the school district by requiring them to campaign for election in all parts of the city.
- * Ensure greater cooperation among board members.

DISTRICT-ONLY ELECTIONS

- * Disempower citizens by allowing them to vote for only one member of the school board rather than all of them.
- * Create a board whose members are accountable only to the needs of voters in their own district.
- * Will not limit the amount of money candidates raise or spend to run for office.

BECAUSE THE ENTIRE SCHOOL BOARD VOTES ON ISSUES AFFECTING ALL STUDENTS THROUGHOUT SAN DIEGO, KEEP YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE FOR ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. MAKE SURE THAT ALL BOARD MEMBERS ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO YOU. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G.

JOAN GASS
Member, San Diego City Schools
Reapportionment Advisory Committee

ROBERT W. COLEMAN
Member, San Diego City Schools
Reapportionment Advisory Committee

KATHLEEN E. GAUSTAD
Chair, San Diego City Schools
Reapportionment Advisory Committee

SUE BRAUN
Member, Board of Education

MARJORIE LARSON
Community Activist/Substitute Teacher

CITY OF SAN DIEGO Proposition H

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

PROP H

AMENDS SECTION 66 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. Increases the number of seats on the San Diego Unified School District Board from five (5) to seven (7) commencing in 1994.

Provides Notice to the Voter, as follows: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition G, which would establish that San Diego Unified School District Board members shall be nominated, elected and recalled by district rather than nominated by district and elected citywide, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter section 66.

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

The portions of the charter to be deleted are printed in ~~strike-out~~ type and the portions to be added are underlined.

Amends Section 66 of the Charter of The City of San Diego to read as follows:

SECTION 66. BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The government of the San Diego Unified School District shall be vested in a Board of Education, composed of ~~five~~ seven members who shall be nominated and elected ~~at the~~ on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election and the California State general election in that year. At the ~~municipal~~ primary election there shall be chosen by the registered voters of each Board of Education District two candidates for the office of any Board of Education member from a District whose term expires the succeeding December. At the general ~~municipal~~ election the registered voters of the whole San Diego Unified School District shall select from among the candidates chosen at the primary election in each district one candidate for the office of each Board of Education member whose term expires the succeeding December. Each candidate for the Board of Education shall have been a registered voter of the San Diego Unified School District and an actual resident of the election district from which ~~he~~ the candidate seeks to be nominated for thirty (30) calendar days immediately preceding filing of a nomination petition. The members shall serve for a term of four years from and after 10 a.m. the first Monday after the first day of December next succeeding this election and until their successors are elected and qualified, except as herein provided. Any vacancy occurring in the Board shall be filled from the election district in which the vacancy occurs by appointment by the remaining Board members; but in the event that said remaining members fail to fill such vacancy by appointment within thirty (30) calendar days after the vacancy occurs, they must immediately cause to be held a primary election in the district in which the vacancy occurs and general election within the entire school district to fill such vacancy; provided, however, that any person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office only until the next regular ~~municipal~~ election, at which date a person shall be elected to serve for the remainder of such unexpired term.

For the purpose of electing members of the Board of Education, the San Diego Unified School District shall be divided into ~~five (5)~~ seven (7) districts as nearly equal in population as practicable. For the first primary and regular election held under this section, as amended, the boundaries of such election districts shall be established by the Board of Education as such Board existed on the effective date of the amendment to this section.

Thereafter, the boundaries of such election districts shall be subject to alteration and change under the provisions of this section. The Board of Education, by resolution, may change and alter the boundaries of the election districts and in the resolution may describe the new boundaries by reference to a map on file in the office of the City Clerk; a metes and bounds description of the new boundaries need not be contained in said resolution.

Upon any redistricting incumbent Board of Education members shall continue to represent the district in which they reside, unless as a result of such redistricting more than one incumbent Board of Education member resides within any one district in which case the Board of Education shall determine by lot which Board of Education member shall represent each district. At the next primary and general elections following a redistricting Board members shall be elected from those districts not represented and from those districts represented by incumbent Board of Education members whose terms expire as of the general election in said year. If as a result of any redistricting more than a simple majority of the Board of Education is scheduled to be elected at the general election next following the redistricting, prior to any such election, the Board of Education shall designate one or more new districts for which the initial Board member term shall be two (2) years in order to retain staggered terms for Board of Education members.

Notice to the Voter: This proposition, if adopted, would amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter. Proposition G, which would establish trustee elections by district only, also appears on this ballot and would also amend Section 66 of the San Diego City Charter if adopted. You may vote for or against either proposition. If both are adopted by majority vote, then Section 66 will be treated as amended to include both amendments. This paragraph will not be codified in Charter Section 66.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Following the recommendations of a broad-based citizens' committee, a majority of the Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District has agreed to place a proposal on the ballot to amend the City charter to increase the number of trustee districts from five to seven.

The seven-trustee area map being proposed provides seven areas virtually equal in total population, and only somewhat less equal in voting-age population. Changing from five to seven trustee areas would reduce the number of residents each board member would represent and thereby enhance the opportunities for citizen participation.

The seven-trustee area map also provides a greater opportunity for improving the diversity of representation on the Board of Education. Proposed trustee areas 1 and 2 would be predominately nonwhite increasing the possibility of electing African American, Asian, or Hispanic board members. The other five proposed trustee areas range from two-thirds to five-sixths white.

Assuming that voters approve a companion charter amendment measure changing from citywide to district-only elections for board members, savings realized from that change could help offset any increase in costs that might result from a seven-member Board of Education.

ANN ARMSTRONG
President, Board of Education

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

The five-member Board of Education has served this district well, and at this time needs no expansion. The board considered the expansion in order to increase the potential for greater diversity of board membership. This goal is one that is supported by the proponents and opponents of the proposition. However, given the demographics of the city, increasing the size of the board will not create greater diversity. The current board has two ethnic majority districts. With the addition of two new districts, there will continue to be only two ethnic majority districts. In fact, the proposal will dilute potential ethnic voting power from 2/5 to 2/7.

The cost of changing from a five- to a seven-member board is also a concern. Given the fact that the proposition does not create greater diversity, it appears to be an unnecessary added expense in time of fiscal constraints.

A seven-member board will create smaller districts and possibly increased accessibility of board members to constituents. However, over the past two years, the district has moved to empower communities in making decisions that affect individual sites and has decreased the number of central office administrators. To increase the board size is contrary to these actions. In line with the district's goals, we should be decreasing the bureaucracy instead of increasing it. Consequently, we recommend a No vote on Proposition H.

KATHLEEN E. GAUSTAD
San Diego City Schools
Reapportionment Advisory Committee

ROBERT W. COLEMAN
San Diego City Schools
Reapportionment Advisory Committee

SHIRLEY N. WEBER
Member, Board of Education

SUE BRAUN
Member, Board of Education

**POLL WORKERS AND FACILITIES NEEDED
MEET YOUR NEIGHBORS!
SERVE YOUR COMMUNITY!**

There is a shortage of poll workers in many San Diego County neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply by completing the application form. If you apply immediately, it is possible that you could be assigned to work at a polling place in the next election.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of poll workers; therefore, homemakers and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The department also pays for the use of facilities to be used as a polling place; i.e., home, clubhouse, business. Since the county continues to grow and population centers shift, new polling places are constantly needed.

You will receive a fee for your services.

Once this application is received you will be contacted by the Registrar of Voters Office.

POLL WORKER AND/OR FACILITY APPLICATION

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZIP _____

TELEPHONE #'s: Home _____ Work _____

Do you have transportation? Yes ☐ No ☐

I want to work in my own precinct ONLY. ☐

I would be willing to travel to serve in another precinct. ☐

I have a facility for use as a precinct polling place
that has good lighting, adequate space for voting booths,
and is accessible to the handicapped. ☐

SIGNATURE _____

MAIL TO: Registrar of Voters, Polls and Officers Section,
P.O. Box 85093, San Diego, California 92186-5093

POLLING PLACE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Where and when may I vote?

Polling places are located in your neighborhood. Voting hours are from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on election day. The polls address is printed above your name on the back cover of your sample ballot pamphlet. The date and election voting times are printed on the front cover.

How do I vote?

Sample ballots and instructions are posted at the polling place. Poll workers are required by law to help if you do not understand the voting procedures. The poll worker will explain and demonstrate the operation of the voting device.

When you enter the polling place, give your name and address; you do not have to show identification. You vote alone in the voting booth unless you ask for help. If you are physically disabled or cannot read English, you may ask any qualified voter or poll worker for assistance.

If you make a mistake, you are entitled to another ballot, but only up to a total of three ballots.

When you have finished voting, the ballot is returned to a poll worker who will deposit it in a ballot box and give you your stub. The ballots remain sealed in the box until the polls are closed. The total number of ballots must equal the number of signatures on the roster at each polling place. After this is verified, the ballots are transported by poll workers and deputy sheriffs to a central location for counting.

May I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?

Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting your official ballot and will shorten the lines at the polls.

Do I have to vote all of my ballot? I only know about some of the candidates and some of the measures.

You may vote on as many offices and/or as many measures as you choose. Voting only part of your ballot does not void your vote.

Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?

Yes. This is called a "write-in" vote. If you want to write in a candidate's name, ask one of the poll workers for assistance; they have a list of qualified write-ins.

What are poll workers?

Poll workers are citizens who have offered their time to operate the polling places on election day. Several poll workers make up a precinct board. This board is usually composed of one inspector and two or more clerks. They must be at least 18 years old and be registered to vote.

Poll workers receive instructions through classes, photo slide presentations, and written materials; they receive a small fee for their valuable community service.

This page would have been blank due to printing layouts. The Registrar of Voters has used this space to provide additional information.

PERMANENT MAIL BALLOT QUALIFICATIONS

Pursuant to California Elections Code 1451, if you . . .

- Have lost, or have lost the use of one or more limbs, or
- Have lost, or have lost the use of both hands, or
- Are unable to move about without the aid of an assistant device, or
- Are suffering from lung disease, blindness, or cardiovascular disease, or
- Have a significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities, or
- Suffer from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with your mobility. . .

you are eligible for permanent mail ballot status.

You will automatically be mailed an official ballot for each election in which you are entitled to vote, unless you fail to return your voted ballot for a statewide primary or general election. In that case, your name will be deleted as a "Permanent Mail Ballot Voter". If you re-register, you must re-apply for permanent mail ballot status.

If you qualify under the provisions listed above for permanent mail ballot status, please contact the Registrar of Voters for an application.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

**P.O. BOX 85520, SAN DIEGO, CA 92186-5520
(619) 694-3415**

ASSISTANCE FOR THE DISABLED

The Registrar of Voters Office has a TDD (Telecommunications Device for the Deaf). For assistance, call 694-3441.

Cassette recordings of propositions are available by contacting any branch library.

The County of San Diego does not discriminate on the basis of disability. If you are disabled and feel you have been denied participation in the electoral process, contact the Registrar of Voters Office at 565-5800 immediately.

A voter unable to mark a ballot may receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

If there is no accessibility to the polling place, the physically disabled may request a regular ballot from a precinct board member and vote it at a location as near as possible outside the polls, which is accessible to the physically disabled.

It is the goal of the Registrar of Voters Office that all polling locations be accessible to the disabled and elderly.



ACCESS?



YES OR NO

Refer to this symbol on the back cover of this pamphlet. If your polling place is not accessible, please call the Registrar of Voters at 694-3400 for alternative voting methods. We will continue our search for an accessible polling facility for future elections.