

Local Propositions

**PROPOSITION A: ESTABLISHES A REGIONAL FIRE PROTECTION AGENCY FOR FIRE SERVICES**

BALLOT QUESTION: To improve wildfire prevention and firefighting capabilities, shall the County of San Diego ordinance be adopted to establish a special fire protection parcel tax and provide for the establishment of a Regional Fire Protection Agency to coordinate expenditures and regional efforts including: Specialized emergency equipment such as helicopters and airplanes; Wildfire training programs for emergency personnel; Communications systems to improve response times; and, Brush clearing and other programs to help prevent wildfires?

THE SITUATION:

Two devastating wildfires within the last five years burned a total of 744,000 acres, destroyed almost 6,000 structures, required widespread evacuations, and caused the deaths of 27 individuals. Fire risks and destructive firestorms have significantly escalated in the past 30 years and are expected to worsen.

San Diego is the largest county in the state without a regional fire agency. The county's volunteer fire protection districts are limited in capability and coordination and the Fire Rescue Department of the City of San Diego fails to meet national standards. Brush management priorities are chronically disregarded. There is consensus that the San Diego region is unprepared for recurrent, major wildfires.

THE PROPOSAL:

- \* Prop A would create a Regional Fire Protection Agency, which would operate as a joint powers authority.
- \* The Regional Agency would be funded through a parcel tax levied on each parcel in the county. The base tax would be \$52 per year with annual increases tied to the cost of living index. Parcels with large buildings (e.g., hi-rises) would be taxed an additional 1¢ per square foot of space beyond 10,000 square feet. Large parcels without structures would be taxed \$1 for every acre beyond 50 acres. Parcel taxes would be capped at \$1,000 per year per lot.
- \* The parcel tax is expected to generate approximately \$50M per year. Half would go to the Regional Agency for regional firefighting efforts, including administrative costs limited to 10%. The remaining half would be divided among the local agencies, which include the County of San Diego, 18 cities, local firefighting agencies in the unincorporated area, and water districts.
- \* The Regional Agency would be governed by a 10-member board made up of the mayor of the City of San Diego; one County supervisor representing the backcountry; four city council members representing North Inland, North Coastal, East and South County; and four fire protection district representatives; plus 5 non-voting members from CalFire, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife, the U.S. Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Native American reservation fire departments.
- \* Board members would serve an indefinite term. Any board member except the mayor of the City of San Diego could be removed by the member's appointing body. Any one of the participating agencies could withdraw from the joint powers agreement.
- \* The Regional Agency would have the power to issue bonds to build and equip firefighting facilities.
- \* Prop A requires approval by a 2/3 majority of those voting on the proposition.

FISCAL EFFECT: Alternative funding sources were not identified and there is no official financial analysis of impacts of Prop A. Given other tax proposals on the Nov. 2008 ballot, local debt service could appreciably increase. This fire protection parcel tax would expire after 30 years.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

- \* Prop A will provide immediate funding for necessary new firefighting equipment, including fire trucks, helicopters, and aerial tankers and enable much-needed improvements in emergency communications systems. Brush management programs will be upgraded.
- \* A Regional Agency will provide a central command and improved firefighting coordination throughout the county.
- \* Prop A parcel taxes would supplement, not replace, local funds used for fire fighting.
- \* Prop A may not be perfect but it is a step in the right direction.

SIGNATURES IN SUPPORT: Jerry Sanders, Mayor of San Diego; Mark Baker, Fire Chief/President, SD County Fire District Assn; William B. Kolender, Sheriff; August Ghio, Fire Chief/President, SD Fire Chief's Assn; Greg Cox, Chair, Board of Supervisors; Ron Roberts, County Supervisor; James A. Floros, Executive Director, Burn Institute; Irving Jacoby, MD; Ron Lane, Director of Emergency Services; Tracy Jarman, Fire Chief, City of San Diego.

OPPONENTS SAY:

- \* Prop A is a politically compromised proposal, lacking in adequate details about how the Regional Agency would be coordinated or held accountable. There are no guarantees about the type or amount of equipment it would secure or the number of professional firefighters to be hired.
- \* Public safety is a basic responsibility of county government but county supervisors routinely shortchange public safety and emergency programs. The county should allocate sufficient funds from its \$4.7B annual budget for fire safety. San Diego County spends approximately \$8.5M annually on fire protection, whereas Orange County spends \$260M and Los Angeles County spends \$860M.
- \* A uniform parcel tax on businesses and homeowners without regard to the value of their property is unfair and regressive, penalizing the working class and retirees. The people living in the unincorporated areas of the county most at risk for wildfires should shoulder most of the tax burden.
- \* Across the board new taxes are a bad idea in unhealthy economic times.

SIGNATURES IN OPPOSITION: Richard Rider, Chairman, San Diego Tax Fighters; Joe Sheffo, Candidate, Encinitas City Council; Allen P. Hemphill, Newspaper Columnist; Gary Pietila, Ranchita Homeowner; Michael Benoit, Chair, Libertarian Party of San Diego County; Joel Anderson, Assemblyman, 77<sup>th</sup> District; Ruth M. Sterling, La Mesa City Councilwoman; Pat Flannery, Real Estate Broker; Louis P. Kartsonis, MD

<b>PROPOSITION B: MARINE FREIGHT PRESERVATION AND BAYFRONT REDEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE – PORT AUTHORITY</b>
--

**BALLOT QUESTION:** Shall the San Diego Unified Port District's Master Plan be amended by the adoption of "The Port of San Diego Marine Freight Preservation and Bayfront Redevelopment Initiative"?

**THE SITUATION:**

The Port District encompasses waterfront properties of Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, National City, Coronado, and San Diego. The Port District was established through state legislation in 1962 to manage San Diego Bay and surrounding waterfront land. Top strategic goals of the Port of San Diego include promoting maritime industries to stimulate regional economic vitality; strengthening the Port's financial performance; sustaining a diverse waterfront; improving environmental conditions of San Diego Bay; and ensuring a safe and secure environment for people, property, and cargo. The Port District is managed by 7 Port Commissioners, each appointed by and answerable to their respective city councils (San Diego makes 3 appointments).

The adopted Port Master Plan is the official document guiding the physical development of waterfront land under Port jurisdiction. Prop B deals with the planning area for the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal and Crosby Street Corridor, a 96-acre maritime cargo complex on the waterfront near downtown San Diego, south of the Convention Center and north of the Coronado Bay Bridge. The Master Plan designates this location for marine-oriented industrial and supporting transportation uses and proposes future intensification of cargo uses.

The Port of San Diego is a Federal Strategic Port Facility, one of 9 designated by the Department of Defense for load-out operations. Many thousands of tons of supplies are periodically shipped overseas from this working marine facility.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

- \* Prop B was created and advanced to the ballot through a signature gathering petition led by a development group, including Richard Chase, Nancy Chase, and Frank Gallagher.
- \* Prop B would amend the Port Master Plan to create a multi-use maritime district at the site of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal and Crosby Street Corridor and change the uses authorized in the Master Plan to accommodate new commercial and recreational uses.
- \* Prop B would not require but would "permit and encourage" the construction of a 96-acre, 40-foot high platform above the Tenth Avenue Terminal that could be developed for commercial uses ranging from hotels, restaurants, a football stadium, an expanded Convention Center, an aquarium, and retail shops. No precise plans have been presented to the public at this time.
- \* The Port would have 60 days after enactment of Prop B to select a private development group and then negotiate an agreement for development, with or without the proposed platform.
- \* Development proposals on this site would require Coastal Commission approval.
- \* Prop B requires approval by a simple majority (over 50%) of those voting on the proposition.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Under current Port practices, waterfront revenues are deposited into the Port's general fund and spent for regional waterfront improvements among the Port District cities. Prop B could change that system and funnel tax revenues from new commercial development of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal directly back into the private development project. This would be similar to the use of tax-increment financing by Redevelopment Agencies. Prop B says that general funds or tax revenues from the Port District or its member cities would not be used for redevelopment of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

- \* Developing a 96-acre deck over the 10th Avenue Marine Terminal could allow for a new sports arena or stadium, allow for expansion of the convention center and bring new tax revenue in from the waterfront.
- \* Prop B would generate badly needed public revenues, in the range of tens of millions of dollars annually. The commercial potential of a 100 acre concrete deck over the Tenth Avenue Terminal represents a visionary approach to redevelopment.
- \* Prop B would enhance maritime jobs, preserve marine freight, and guarantee protection for all existing businesses and jobs.
- \* Prop B redevelopment at the Tenth Avenue Terminal would come at no cost to taxpayers.

SIGNATURES IN SUPPORT: Frank E. Gallagher, Partner of San Diego Community Solutions; John T. Lynch, President & CEO of Broadcast Company of the Americas; Scott Barnett, President of Taxpayers Advocates.org; Malcolm Franks, MBE, Retired CEO; Keith Battle, Water Board Director; Sheila Seagrave, Non-profit Director.

OPPONENTS SAY:

- \* Prop B is a land grab by wealthy developers that will destroy essential port capacity for cargo ships at the Tenth Avenue Terminal.
- \* Prop B is a politically-motivated challenge to the Port District over management of the waterfront. By sidestepping the Port Commission and short-circuiting comprehensive Port planning, Prop B would permit a private development group to sacrifice the public interest for their own private profits.
- \* Prop B would result in the loss of over tens of thousands of good-paying jobs and substitute low wage tourism-related jobs. Marine transport of goods would be shifted to truck traffic, increasing pollution and highway congestion.
- \* The proposed 96-acre deck would create unworkable security and logistical problems, destroying the economic viability of a working waterfront.
- \* Prop B would wipe out a Barrio Logan cultural treasure and landmark, Cesar Chavez Park (formerly known as Crosby Street Park).
- \* Military experts say that commercial development at the Tenth Avenue Terminal could create a security risk, endanger public safety, and have drastic consequences on military out-load operations.

SIGNATURES IN OPPOSITION: Michael B. Bixler, Chairman, Port of San Diego; Lorena Gonzalez, CEO and Secretary-Treasurer, San Diego Labor Council; Terry E. Magee, President, San Diego Military Advisory Council; John C. O'Neill, Chair, San Diego County Taxpayers Association; Diane Takvorian, Executive Director, Environmental Health Coalition; Isabella A. Heule, President/CEO, SD World Trade Center; Steven Erie, UCSD Professor of Political Science and Specialist on Ports; Edward F. Plant, Chairman, SD Port Tenants Assn.; James R. Mills, Former CA State Senator; Peter M. Zschiesche, Trustee, Machinists Union #389, Trustee, SD Community College District.

**PROPOSITION C: AMENDS THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
DESIGNATING THE USE OF LEASE REVENUE FROM MISSION BAY PARK**

**BALLOT QUESTION:** Shall the City Charter be amended requiring that annual lease revenue generated in Mission Bay Park exceeding \$23 million initially and decreasing to \$20 million after 5 years be appropriated 75% for capital improvements in Mission Bay Park and 25% for capital improvements in Chollas Lake, Balboa, Mission Trails, Otay River Valley, Presidio and San Diego River Parks; open space parks; coastal beaches and contiguous coastal parks; and future Regional Parks?

**THE SITUATION:** The tidal marshes of "False Bay" were dredged and filled in the late 1940s and gradually transformed into a tourist and recreational center now known as Mission Bay Park. The City Charter limits commercial leases in Mission Bay Park to 25% of dedicated land area and 6.5% of dedicated water area.

Estimated lease revenue from Mission Bay Park for 2009 is \$30M. By 2016 it is expected to increase to \$36.7M. Under current City law, lease revenue in excess of \$20M is supposed to be split between Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks with a total cap of \$5M. However, the City has not fully funded these Parks up to that amount. Currently, the City has the authority to suspend or modify Park allocations under special circumstances.

**THE PROPOSAL:**

- \* Prop C would amend the City Charter by establishing a new funding formula for a 30 year period for distributing revenues from Mission Bay Park business leases.
- \* Prop C would lift the existing \$5M cap on the amount designated for infrastructure in Mission Bay and Regional Parks and provide a larger share of revenues for Parks improvements.
- \* Prop C would put a cap on the share of Mission Bay Park lease revenues that goes into the City's General Fund -- \$23M for the next 5 years and \$20M for the following 25 years.
- \* Prop C's 30-year duration is intended to provide a dedicated, irrevocable revenue stream and permit the use of long-term financing options to fund significant Park improvement projects.
- \* Prop C defines and prioritizes capital improvement projects in Mission Bay Park, including restoration of navigable waters (dredging), wetland expansion and water quality improvements, shoreline restoration, expansion of endangered species habitats, completion of bicycle and pedestrian paths, boardwalk and seawall restoration, and repair of parking lots. Lower priority improvements could be advanced under defined circumstances.
- \* Prop C applies to Regional Parks, including Chollas Lake, Balboa, Mission Trails, Otay River, Presidio, San Diego River and Open Space Parks, plus coastal beaches and future Regional Parks. Funds may be used for capital improvements. Lease revenues would no longer fund planning, deferred maintenance, or land acquisition.
- \* Prop C designates the Mission Bay Park Committee and the Park & Recreation Board as the initial oversight committees.
- \* Prop C requires approval by a simple majority (over 50%) of those voting on the proposition.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

Under Prop C, the City's General Fund could experience a decrease in revenues from Mission Bay Park revenue leases of approximately \$3M in 2010, increasing to \$11.7M in 2016. Under Prop C, annual allocations into the Mission Bay Park Improvement Fund could more than double by 2010 and significantly increase thereafter. Substantial benefits could also accrue to the Regional Park Improvement Fund. Additional workload and increased costs for new staffing needs for Parks improvements have not been quantified.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

- \* Mission Bay Park lease revenues were originally intended to provide greater benefits to Mission Bay Park. But Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks have never received their \$5M share because revenues have been and continue to be siphoned off into the General Fund for non-emergency City expenses.
- \* Independent oversight committees will ensure that funds are spent exclusively for Park improvements.
- \* Under Prop C, the General Fund will receive a steady, guaranteed share of lease revenues (\$23M for the first 5 years, then \$20M after that).
- \* As lease revenues increase, Mission Bay Park and other Regional Parks will be guaranteed a fair share to help pay for capital improvements. This will benefit visitors and all San Diegans, alike.
- \* Prop C would eliminate the need for new taxes to fund Mission Bay Park and Regional Park improvements.
- \* Prop C would protect the Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks from being starved by San Diego's long-term "structural deficit."

SIGNATURES IN SUPPORT: Councilmember Donna Frye; Councilmember Kevin Faulconer; Wilbur Smith, Chair, San Diego Park & Recreation Board; Bob Otilie, Past Chair, Mission Bay Park Committee; Mayor Jerry Sanders.

OPPONENTS SAY:

- \* While increasing revenues for Regional Park purposes is necessary and desirable, the Prop C process was overly rushed and monopolized by top officials.
- \* Public input was too limited, particularly concerning the Prop C list of priority projects for Mission Bay Park. For example, Fiesta Island and South Shore improvements are high priorities in the Mission Bay Park Master Plan but are not included on the Prop C priority list. Boardwalk and parking lot improvements not within park boundaries should not be on the priority list.
- \* Earmarking the City of San Diego General Fund revenues should be avoided since earmarking reduces budgetary flexibility.
- \* San Diego is suffering from grave budgetary problems and expects long-range budget deficits. The City cannot afford any decrease in General Fund revenues, especially from a strong and reliable source like lease revenues.
- \* Prop C would prevent the City from temporarily suspending the requirement to share lease revenues with Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks if the Mayor determines that General Fund revenues are insufficient to maintain existing City services or that a fiscal emergency exists.

SIGNATURES IN OPPOSITION: No opposing arguments or signatures were submitted to the City Clerk.

**PROPOSITION D: MAKING ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION UNLAWFUL AT CITY BEACHES, MISSION BAY PARK, AND COASTAL PARKS**

BALLOT QUESTION: Shall the People of the City of San Diego amend the San Diego Municipal Code section 56.54 to make the consumption of alcohol unlawful at City beaches, Mission Bay Park, and coastal parks?

THE SITUATION: Permanent alcohol bans presently exist on certain San Diego beaches and coastal parks. Temporary alcohol bans have also been enacted to address specific problems. Establishing a permanent alcohol ban on all City beaches, at Mission Bay Park, and in coastal parks was proposed following a major alcohol-related beach brawl that took place during the 2007 Labor Day weekend.

THE PROPOSAL:

- \* Prop D would make it illegal to consume alcoholic drinks at any time on San Diego public beaches (including adjacent sidewalks, boardwalks, piers, right-of-way, coastal bluffs, parks, view points, parking lots on the ocean and in Mission Bay Park, plus at least 20 local parks).
- \* The alcohol ban would not apply to special events permits, lease agreements, sidewalk cafes, or Mission Beach and Torrey Pines Golf Courses.
- \* Violations would be charged and prosecuted as either an infraction or misdemeanor.
- \* Prop D would replace efforts made over the past 30 years to set temporary and/or partial regulation of alcohol consumption with a uniform and complete ban on public beaches, parks, and adjacent areas.
- \* Prop D requires approval by a simple majority (over 50%) of those voting on the proposition.

FISCAL EFFECT: No analysis is available to determine whether demands or costs for enforcement would increase or decrease. There is no analysis of potential impacts on sales taxes or transient occupancy taxes.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

- \* Alcohol is legally consumed on only a handful of California beaches. San Diego has been the exception rather than the rule in permitting alcohol consumption at certain times and public places.
- \* The result has been increased crime, littering, and drunken driving accidents, plus increased out-of-towners' partying on community beaches. Abuses of alcohol consumption abound and resulted in last year's Labor Day beach fracas and arrest of 15 people by San Diego police in riot gear.
- \* The trial ban has reduced beach area crime, benefits local business, and provides citizens with safe, clean beaches.
- \* Beaches have been safer, cleaner, and friendlier during the temporary ban. A permanent alcohol ban on San Diego's beaches is clearly overdue.

SIGNATURES IN SUPPORT: Tracy Jarman, SD Fire Chief; Bill Nemecek, President, SD Police Officers Association; Randy Strunk, Business Owner, Surf Shop & Surf School; Julie Klein, Beach Area Small Business Owner and Parent; Ken Hewitt, San Diego Lifeguard Chief.

OPPONENTS SAY:

- \* An alcohol ban is an attack on personal rights and freedom.
- \* Prop D is too broad. Most beachgoers are law-abiding and do not abuse alcohol on the beaches.
- \* Alcohol-related concerns can be minimized through public education, increased numbers of trash receptacles, more police presence, increased fines, and zero-tolerance enforcement.
- \* Punish the troublemakers, not law-abiding beachgoers.

SIGNATURES IN OPPOSITION: Roger Hedgecock, Jim Madaffer, President Pro-Tem, SD City Council; George Plescia, Assemblyman 75th District, California State Legislature; David J. Gersz, President, SD County Young Democrats; Michael Benoit, Chair, SD County Libertarian Party Chair; Jacob Pyle, San Diego Safe Beach Coalition.

## **PROPOSITION S: SAN DIEGO SCHOOL REPAIR AND SAFETY MEASURE OF 2008**

**BALLOT QUESTION:** Shall San Diego Unified School District issue \$2,100,000,000 in bonds at legal interest rates, requiring independent citizen oversight, annual audits, NO money for administrators, and bonds issued only if NO estimated tax rate increase to improve every neighborhood school by: repairing outdated student restrooms, deteriorated plumbing and roofs; upgrading career/vocational classrooms and labs; providing up-to-date classroom technology; improving school safety/security; replacing dilapidated portable classrooms; upgrading fire alarms; and removing hazardous substances?

### **THE SITUATION:**

- \* In 1998, San Diego voters approved Proposition MM, authorizing the SD Unified School District to issue \$1.51B in bonds to modernize and construct school facilities. Prop MM will expire in 2029.
- \* In 2000, California voters approved Proposition 39, amending the California Constitution to lower the voting requirement for school bonds from 2/3 voter approval to 55% approval with the requirement that bond funds be used only for construction, rehabilitation, equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities. A specific list of school projects to be funded is also required.

### **THE PROPOSAL:**

- \* Prop S would authorize the District to issue \$2.1B in bond obligations in addition to Prop MM funds and extend the Prop MM tax rate (\$66.70 per \$100,000 assessed value of taxable property) to 2044.
- \* Prop S would fund maintenance and improvement projects at 180 school facilities throughout the district, charter schools included. The proposed bond project list is not binding. Projects could be modified by the school board in response to changes in needs, funding, or priorities.
- \* The list includes repair of outdated student restrooms, repair of deteriorated plumbing and roofs, upgrade of career/vocational classrooms and labs, up-to-date classroom technology, school safety/security improvements, replacement of dilapidated portable classrooms, and removal of hazardous substances.
- \* Prop S would provide site discretionary funds to all schools equivalent to \$150 per student for use on qualified projects.
- \* Bond proceeds may not be used for teacher or administrator salaries or other school operating expenses but may be used to pay or reimburse the District for the cost of District staff when performing work on or necessary and incidental to the bond projects.
- \* The Board of Education would establish an independent citizens' oversight committee and conduct annual audits.
- \* These bonds could be used only for acquisition of school sites, construction, rehabilitation, or replacement, furnishing, and equipping of school facilities but not for other uses, like salaries or central administration.
- \* Prop S requires approval by 55% of those voting on the proposition, based on the terms of Prop 39.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Repayment of Prop S bonds would incorporate the repayment of Prop MM bonds, extending the repayment period by an additional 15 years. The combined tax rate for Props S and MM would not exceed the existing rate of \$66.70 per \$100,000 assessed valuation. The sale of Prop S bonds to raise money for the District represents a debt of the District. Principal and interest would be paid from an annual tax levied on taxable properties within the District. The actual tax rates and the years in which they will apply may vary from present estimations, as will

the actual interest rates at which the bonds will be sold. Actual future assessed valuation will depend upon the amount and value of taxable property within the District as determined by the County Assessor in the annual assessment and equalization process.

**SUPPORTERS SAY:**

- \* Prop S is needed to fix a broad array of urgent problems in our schools, from deteriorating roofs and plumbing, to removing hazardous asbestos and mold, to upgrading classrooms with new technology and internet capability.
- \* Prop MM Bonds improved the School District by funding repairs at 161 schools, construction of 12 new schools and rebuilding 3 schools. Prop S would replace expiring MM bonds with new ones, ensuring that funds will be available for improvements and repairs at a time when state support for schools has taken a sharp downturn.
- \* Prop S will ensure new and upgraded technology and Internet access to all schools in all neighborhoods.
- \* Prop S will not increase the tax rate and will be closely monitored by an independent citizens' oversight committee and annual audits.
- \* School repairs should be done now, before they become even more expensive.

**SIGNATURES IN SUPPORT:** John King, SDUSD Teacher of the Year, Scripps Ranch High; Linda Taggart, Principal of the Year; John O'Neill, chairman SD Taxpayers Assn; Raymond Sanchez, PTA President; Bill Nemec, President, SD Police Officers Assn.; Donald J. Braun, Chief of Police, SD City Schools; Joe Carta, Real Estate Broker; Ruben Barrales, President & CEO, SD Regional Chamber of Commerce.

**OPPONENTS SAY:**

- \* Although support for schools is of great importance, Prop S is a hasty, misleading, and loosely constructed bond proposal that would impose excessive property taxes on young home buyers and first-time homeowners already saddled with a disproportionate burden of property taxes due to San Diego's inflated housing market.
- \* Prop MM authorized bond sales of \$1.51B and is due to expire in 20 years. This is not the time to borrow an additional \$2.1B.
- \* Prop S falls short of state standards for bond measures authorized to pass with 55% (instead of 2/3) voter approval because there are no binding commitments to implement the listed school improvements. Prop S states that "inclusion of a project on the Bond Project List is not a guarantee that the project will be funded or completed."
- \* Bond financing should be used for capital improvement projects and not for off-loading routine maintenance and repairs, which should be funded through the District annual budgeting process. Bond money should not go to each and every school strictly on the basis of student enrollment.
- \* Upgrades, improvements and new school construction in the City's Redevelopment areas should not be financed through bond measures like Prop S. They should be paid for with new tax revenues from development inside the Redevelopment area. The Redevelopment Agency should pay its fair share for adequate schools and not be allowed to shortchange taxpayers and the school system.
- \* Prop S fails to build in cost-savings measures to increase sustainability and energy efficiency. For example, it would increase District operating expenses for utility bills for projects like new air conditioning.

**SIGNATURES IN OPPOSITION::** Pat Flannery, Real Estate Broker; Margaret Kuyper, Retired Educator; Richard Rider, Chairman, San Diego Tax Fighters.