

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Record Group/Collection:** George H.W. Bush Presidential Records  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Speech File Backup Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13734  
**Folder ID Number:** 13734-007

---

**Folder Title:**  
California GOP / Los Angeles 10/26/90 [OA 6896]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

---

*Carol*

90 OCT 24 P5: 47

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT  
TO  
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: 10/24

TO: SPEECHWRITING

No: (202) 456-6218

FROM: ANDY FOSTER

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

No. of Pages 2, including this cover sheet.

Please contact ANDY immediately at  
(714) 263-1910 if you do not receive this transmission in its  
entirety.

Message:

*Let me know if you  
have questions.  
Thanks!*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

TO: OFFICE OF SPEECHWRITING  
FR: ANDY FOSTER - POLITICAL AFFAIRS *mk* → (IN IRVINE STAFF OFFICE)  
RE: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS -- IRVINE AND LOS ANGELES, CA

IRVINE, CA

- Mrs. Pete Wilson (Gayle) - Wife of Sen. Wilson
- Mr. Donald Bren - Event Co-Chairman
- Mr. George Argyros - Event Co-Chair (AR-GEER-OS)
- Hon. Marian Bergeson - Lt. Governor nominee
- Hon. Tom Hayes - State Treasurer nominee
- Mr. Frank Visco - California GOP Chairman
- Mr. Tom Fuentes - Orange County GOP Chairman

LOS ANGELES, CA

- Mrs. Pete Wilson (Gayle) - Wife of Sen. Wilson
- Hon. and Mrs. George Deukmejian (Gloria) - Gov. of CA
- Hon. Ross Johnson - Assembly Minority Leader
- Hon. Ken Maddy - Senate Minority Leader
- Mr./Mrs. Matt Fong (Paula) - Controller nominee
- Hon. Marian Bergeson - Lt. Governor nominee
- Hon. Joan Milkey Flores - Sec. of State nominee
- Hon. Tom Hayes - Treasurer nominee
- Mr. Mel Torme - Entertainer
- Mr. Tom Selleck - Actor
- Mr./Mrs. Donald O'Connor (Gloria) - Entertainer

as of 10/24/90 5:30 p.m. (EST)

LCDR PATTERSON, USN  
J03220, 808-477-1351  
24 OCTOBER 1990

### INFORMATION PAPER

Subj: DIGEST OF HURRICANE OFA/MILITARY ACTIONS

Hurricane OFA struck American Samoa and several other South Pacific Islands 4 February 1990. It wiped out over 95 percent of American Samoa's crops and caused an estimated \$19.5 million in damage to schools, electric systems and roads. Three people were killed, 200 left homeless and countless buildings damaged by high winds and water. President Bush declared the U.S. territory a disaster area 9 Feb 1990.

Relief efforts were coordinated by a joint U.S. task force under the command of Army Colonel John Castleberry. The executive agency was the Hawaii-based U.S. Army Western Command (now U.S. Army Pacific). A C-5B Galaxy arrived at Faleolo International Airport 8 Feb 1990 with two UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, five vehicles including a fully loaded two-and-a-half-ton truck, three trailers, a generator, hundreds of pounds of food, medicine and supplies, and 57 military personnel.

Members of the task force helped open rock quarries in Western Samoa to produce gravel for repairing roads damaged by the storm. The unit completed damage assessments on storm-torn roads, harbors, government buildings and telecommunication systems. During their 23-day stay on the island they flew 117 helicopter resupply missions, delivering over 160 tons of food to villages on the islands of Upolu and Savaii.

The disaster relief task force -- comprised of Army, Navy and Air Force personnel -- included an engineer, an attorney, medical staff, search and rescue teams, communication and supply groups and Navy Seabees.

The people of Western Samoa are carrying on with their customary graciousness. Crowds again pack the public markets in Apia and Faleolo Airport is in operation.

Sen Wil not in Irvine  
→ OK tomorrow AM  
Tom Selleck not at LA  
instead ~~Scott~~ Baio  
Chachi

→ could come on AFI w/ POTUS

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1990

Dear ~~Joyce~~:

I would like to re-confirm the basic details of the President's participation in a fundraising event for Senator Pete Wilson on October 26, 1990. As you know, this is an ongoing process--some of this information may be subject to change. However, you may use this information for your planning purposes until further notice.

EVENT: Pete Wilson for Governor Presidential Lunch

DATE: Friday, October 26, 1990

TIME: 12:00 p.m. - approximate Presidential arrival time  
(15 minutes - photo-op for \$50,000 donors)  
(15 minutes - major donor photo-op)  
(15 minutes - remarks at dinner)

LOCATION: Century Plaza Hotel  
Los Angeles, California

STRUCTURE: Three Tiers:  
1.) Private \$50,000 donor photo-op \*  
2.) Private major donor photo-op \*  
3.) Lunch - Remarks

\* No more than 100 photos maximum between the two photo-ops

MEDIA: Both receptions: closed press, no remarks  
Dinner: open press, with remarks

COST: TBD, deposit check due 24 hours before the event (made payable to the Republican National Committee)

*Trip Coordinator  
Lucy Muckerman*



# Pass More Laws, Set More Limits? How I'd Help the Environment

■ Put decision-making in hands of local citizens, but within a framework of statewide concerns and priorities.

By DIANNE FEINSTEIN

We are fast approaching an environmental crisis in California. A decade of environmental neglect has led to mounting problems. According to:

■ The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, more than 2 billion gallons of sewage are dumped off California's coast each day.

■ A study at the University of Southern California, children growing up in the Los Angeles Basin suffer a 20% reduced lung capacity.

■ The state Department of Food and Agriculture, 600 million pounds of pesticides were sold for use in California in 1987—20 pounds for every man, woman and child in this state in a single year.

■ A recent health study by the Natural Resources Defense Council, between 5,000 and 6,000 children who are preschoolers today may get cancer as a result of their exposure before six years of age to pesticides commonly found in fruits and vegetables.

■ The U.S. Department of the Interior, there is a 94% chance of a major Valdez-size spill off the California coast in the next 30 years. A spill of that size could cover the shoreline from Mendocino to San Diego.

California is already home to 30 million people. We are the largest and the fastest-growing state in the nation. And we are expected to grow by another one-third over the next 20 years.

Everywhere I go throughout the state, I see evidence of our unmanaged growth. Freeways are in gridlock. Two weeks ago, the beaches were closed because of sewage pollution in Santa Monica Bay. The air we breathe and the water we drink is increasingly contaminated. And all of this is due, in large part, to our tremendous population growth and the fact that we have no way of managing it.

Everywhere I go, people are putting growth-control measures on the ballot. Most pass. But growth can be stopped in one community only to overflow into another. Our schools are still overcrowded, our sewers are still overburdened and our air gets worse. Piecemeal measures don't work.

In this campaign, we have proposed a bold growth management program that will seek as its goal not only a jobs/housing balance, but also the infrastructure necessary to sustain growth. This program will integrate air quality, water quality, transportation and business concerns into a comprehensive statewide planning policy.

While this plan will leave most decision-making in the hands of local citizens, these decisions will be made within a framework of statewide concerns and priorities. Basically, the plan has four parts:

Propose a California Growth Management Commission to prepare for legislative adoption a statement of statewide policies aimed at creating a balance between jobs and housing to reduce commute times, encouraging public transit, ensuring adequate recreation areas and providing sufficient infrastructure to support any new development.

Give regional governments the responsibility to formulate growth management plans for their districts, including the ability to establish greenbelts, protect recreation areas, protect agricultural land and decide which areas have the necessary infrastructure to support new growth.

Offer those regions whose plans comply with state policies a package of infrastructure benefits and other fiscal incentives.

Lastly, give regional bodies the teeth they need to enforce their growth management plans.

In developing this growth management plan, we consulted with organizations such as LA 2000 and Bay Vision 2020. There is a regional government bill pending in the Legislature that could be the vehicle for this growth-management proposal.

There are other steps we must take to protect ourselves against environmental disaster. Californians can't sit back and wait for Washington to solve our environmental problems.

The most important thing we can do to protect our air and water quality is to elect an activist governor who cares about protecting our environment and is tough enough to do it.

We have put forward a water policy for the state, a plan that emphasizes water quality and conservation, water banking and reclamation. We have pledged to quadruple the number of toxic waste Superfund sites that are cleaned up. We have offered an energy policy that will increase our energy independence and protect our environment. And we have suggested needed steps to protect air quality, by tightening automobile mileage standards, promoting clean fuel alternatives and improving our transportation system.

I am very proud to be the only candidate in this race who supports Proposition 128—Big Green—the environmental initiative sponsored by the Sierra Club and every other major environmental organization in the state of California.

Big Green takes some very simple, long-overdue steps. It phases out the use of 20 cancer-causing pesticides on our food in five to eight years and replaces them with safer alternatives. It sets up additional oil-spill prevention measures and would prohibit dumping of improperly treated sewage into our oceans. It would phase out the use of chemicals that are depleting our ozone layer and replace them with alternatives that don't contribute to global warming. And it would help save the remaining 5% of our ancient stands of old-growth redwoods.

Clearly, California can't afford another decade of environmental drift. We need to act now—by passing the Big Green initiative and electing a governor who will make growth management a top priority—to ensure that the environmental legacy we pass on to our children is one of a healthy, clean and safe California.

■ Manage growth with regional entities and conserve water by storage and recycling.

By PETE WILSON

**Clean Air**—The most dramatic way to clean polluted air is to move, as the state of California has proposed, to alternative fueled vehicles beginning with model year 1994. Regrettably, the proposed federal statute permits only California to impose such a mandate and denies other states that same authority.

How much fairer it would be to spread the cost burden of achieving clean-car technology over the broad base of customers of the giant auto makers and oil companies than to require the operators of a mom-and-pop dry-cleaning business to purchase a \$80,000 piece of equipment to reduce their cleaning solvents emissions.

It would also be far wiser to move to alter native fuels to reduce U.S. dependency on imported oil.

**Regional government**—Entities such as the South Coast Air Quality Management District that are exclusively concerned with clean air do serve a useful purpose. It makes sense to deal with clean air problems by regulation and enforcement through a local entity that conforms to geographic rather than political boundaries.

It makes no sense to usurp local land use jurisdiction, which should properly be reserved to local governments, and transfer such authority to the state or newly created regional body. A local decision that would threaten air or water quality can be prevented by imposing the checks contained in existing law.

**Growth Management**—Local governments have an obligation to regulate land use within their boundaries and to engage in coordinated planning and cooperation with other local agencies on a regional basis.

Proper growth management should include directing residential development into areas where there are existing public facilities and services, or where they can be provided without a premature, inefficient and costly extension of them. It includes aggressive economic development, so that jobs keep pace with population growth. It includes taking actions to prevent congestion and other activities that threaten the quality of air or water.

**Limiting immigration**—A state cannot limit immigration. Though we should celebrate our diversity as a strength and distinct cultural asset, there is a limit on the financial burden the federal government can equitably impose through allocation of refugees. Once refugees or legal immigrants are

admitted to the United States, they, like citizens from other states, have a right of travel that is guaranteed by the Constitution. States have tried (Hawaii repeatedly) to impose residency requirements as a bar to eligibility for state benefits, but the Supreme Court has consistently held such efforts unconstitutional.

**Clean water**—California's problem is less a shortage of clean water than a shortage of water.

Not that we have solved all our problems of water quality. But conscientious implementation by state and local water agencies of the provisions of Proposition 65 relating to clean drinking water and those of the federal Clean Water Act will address most problems of quality.

The most important problem in terms of the quality of drinking water is ensuring adequate freshwater flows into California's great "well," the Sacramento River Delta, to prevent saltwater intrusion and to ensure sufficient quality in the delta and San Francisco Bay.

Determining the amount of freshwater flows from the Sacramento River into the delta to ensure such quality is the task of an EPA study committee whose work I have supported by securing a federal grant of \$12 million. Their efforts must be considered by the state Water Resources Control Board.

**Conservation by off-stream storage of surplus water**—California is suffering its fourth year of drought. In an average year we enjoy enough precipitation in the winter through snowfall and storms to produce for a brief time what is surplus water, the kind of runoff that in a matter of hours or at best days, simply flows out to sea. Except for the very temporary flushing condition that it provides in improving the water quality of the bay and the delta, that surplus is lost.

What we must do instead is to so manage our resources to guarantee the year-round water quality of the delta and the bay. We need greatly expanded off-stream storage capacity. Two obvious examples are the reservoir that has been authorized at the Los Baños Grandes and the remarkable natural underground storage capacity of the aquifer in Kern County.

**Conservation by recycling**—We recycle less than 1% of the total supply of water that we use in California. The Tillman Reclamation Center is now treating 40 million gallons of water a day to a standard that is described as advanced secondary. And what happens then? I watched it wash out to sea through the Los Angeles River. We must recycle such water. That is why I have endorsed Proposition 148, which authorizes a \$380-million bond issue.

There is no question about what the priorities are. People are the first priority. The users in the cities, in the suburbs come first and agriculture comes second. But it makes more sense to conserve a sufficient amount through recycling and through storage so that we do not have to artificially constrict an industry important to all California.

Agriculture is important to all of us because it provides employment to hundreds of thousands of Californians—all of those in the chain of marketing and distribution from the fields, to the packing sheds, to the supermarkets.

Photo Copy Preservation

## AN OP-ED DEBATE

Fourth in a five-part series

Recently *The Times* invited gubernatorial candidates Dianne Feinstein and Pete Wilson to participate in a number of issue discussions on this page. Today's question is: *There's a shortage of clean water and clean air. What would help more: more federal environmental laws, or regional kinds of government? Limiting further immigration or limiting real-estate development? The final topic, to appear next week, will be education.*

# A Tale of Two Cities May Decide Governor's Race

■ **Politics:** Feinstein's and Wilson's mayoral records could tell voters how they would govern California

By DANIEL M. WEINTRAUB  
TIMES STAFF WRITER

Dianne Feinstein rose from tragedy to guide her city in troubled times. Pete Wilson was elected in scandal's wake and led his city to maturity.

Now, Democrat Feinstein of San Francisco and Republican Wilson of San Diego are battling to become the first former mayor elected governor of California since 1930.

Their records as mayors are as different as the cities themselves.

Feinstein took a city wrenched by the assassination of her predecessor and tried to soothe its wounds. A centrist, she sought to mediate disputes among the fractured city's many factions.

Wilson was elected mayor of San Diego not long after seven of the City Council's nine members were indicted for corruption. He staked out an ambitious agenda and created his own power base to enact it, presiding over the transformation of a backwater Navy town into a major metropolis.

Both candidates probably take more credit than they deserve for their cities' successes and receive more than their fair share of blame for the foibles. But it seems clear that their training as municipal leaders has given Wilson and Feinstein a deep understanding of the problems people face in California's cities.

The issues that affect people's  
Please see MAYORS, A22

# MAYORS: Candidates' Record Leading Cities

**Continued from A1**  
lives—their health and welfare, their safety—come at [a mayor] like heat-seeking missiles,” said Art Agnos, who succeeded Feinstein in San Francisco. “There’s no ducking them the way you can as a U.S. senator or a state legislator or an attorney general.”

Of the two candidates, Feinstein’s experience was more like that of a governor. The combined city and county government she ran was responsible for the complete range of public services, from police and fire and jails to health and welfare. She oversaw the city’s staff, introduced a budget each year and could veto actions of the Board of Supervisors.

Wilson’s power was more limited. He had one vote on the nine-member City Council over which he presided. The city’s department heads were hired and fired by a professional city manager who answered to the council majority. In San Diego, the county government, not the city, provides the region’s health and welfare services.

When Wilson took over, San Diego was like a child about to burst into robust adolescence. The city’s population was almost all white, and its vast undeveloped areas were giving way to tract homes filled with newcomers, most of them Republicans. Political influence was concentrated in a

clique of conservative downtown power brokers.

Feinstein’s San Francisco was a multiethnic stewpot, a population then about the same as San Diego’s but stuffed into an area only one-seventh the size. There was no vacant land and any development would displace existing structures. Power flowed from the city’s liberal Democratic majority and was shared by the mayor and an independent-minded Board of Supervisors.

In these different settings, the records Feinstein and Wilson built as city leaders show how they confronted challenges and solved problems. Their parallel experiences revealed their management styles and may illustrate how they would run the state.

If the difference between the two can be boiled down to a paragraph, it might be this:

Wilson’s first goal was to keep taxes low. He ranked the city’s services and funded those he could. Lesser priorities were eliminated or cut back. Feinstein inventoried her city’s needs and calculated the cost of meeting them. Then she found the money to pay the bills, raising taxes if necessary.

The differences went deeper than that.

When Wilson came into office in 1971 after five years as an assemblyman, San Diego was fresh from

the indictment of seven of the city’s nine council members on charges of taking bribes from Yellow Cab Co. Past mayors had been little more than figureheads, and Wilson proclaimed his intention to make the mayor the political leader of the city.

He did so by declaring a set of priorities, most of which would not cost the city money, and pursuing them doggedly. He succeeded in spurring the redevelopment of downtown San Diego, enacting a campaign finance law, slowing growth in the suburbs, and regulating billboards. He tried, and failed, to move the city’s airport and build a downtown convention center.

“When Pete came on, this city was like a large Santa Barbara. It was just about to boom and explode,” said Louis Wolfsheimer, an attorney and longtime Wilson ally. “He was mayor during the most important part of the history of this community.”

Wilson asked San Diego voters to give him “strong mayor” powers, but the ballot measure was defeated. Instead, he built a power base by helping to elect or appoint members of the City Council and calling on their loyalty to win votes for his programs. He created a committee system dominated by the mayor’s office to ride herd on the city manager.

Former Councilman Mike Gotch, a Wilson adversary, said the mayor was a “masterful” politician.

“He was able to manipulate the council,” Gotch said. “They all got

Please see MAYORS, A23

# MAYORS: Different Styles

Continued from A22

there, either by appointment or election, through his good graces. There were IOUs that were called in."

In San Francisco, Feinstein, a veteran member of the Board of Supervisors, was on the verge of quitting politics in 1978 when Mayor George Moscone and Supervisor Harvey Milk were shot and killed by former Supervisor Dan White. The killings came just days after the Jonestown Massacre, in which 900 members of the San Francisco-based People's Temple died in a mass suicide.

As president of the board, Feinstein became the acting mayor.

"This was a city that was totally reeling in a sense of grief and disaster and dismay," said Hadley Roff, Feinstein's longtime chief of staff. "Through her kind of calm purposefulness, she reunified, she brought the city back together."

Feinstein completed Moscone's term and then won two more in her own right. In contrast to Wilson, she was more reactive, addressing her city's many problems as they arose but never setting much of a long-term agenda. Her style, said one former city official, was the "squeaky wheel" approach to management.

Feinstein was known as a "micro-manager" because of the way she demanded details from her department heads. In weekly management meetings, she would want to know the latest crime statistics,

hospital bed counts, number of AIDS patients, and potholes filled. She had a police radio on her dashboard and a fire coat and boots in the trunk of her car.

Said Roff: "She would be driving through the city and if she'd see a discarded mattress on a corner or an abandoned car, there would be a note taken and word relayed when she got to the office to the appropriate department to take care of it."

This attention to minutiae endeared Feinstein to the voters but led some to conclude that the mayor had lost sight of the big picture.

"Her world view sometimes is obscured by her obsession with detail," said Dick Sklar, a former city public utilities director. "She tends to be more crisis-oriented than systematic."

After California voters passed Proposition 13, throwing city finances into chaos, Feinstein supported increases in the hotel room tax, the business payroll tax and city parking taxes. Later, she pushed for new city taxes on gas, water, electric and telephone bills. The utility tax was approved by the Board of Supervisors but voters overturned it in a referendum.

Still, the city ran short of funds. Several years running, fiscal analysts warned that the city was headed for a deficit, and each year Feinstein's Administration took steps to avert the shortfall by increasing taxes and fees or cutting spending. In 1986 and 1987, Fein-

stein personally reviewed every requisition to hire new employees, keeping an eye out for positions that could be left open.

After she left office, another shortfall was projected, this one of \$172 million. Agnos closed the gap the same way she had, with a combination of spending cuts and higher taxes and fees.

Former Deputy Mayor James Lazarus said the city "could not have functioned" after Proposition 13 without tax increases to make up the loss of property tax money.

"Fighting AIDS, hiring more police officers, housing the homeless—these are programs the public demanded, the situation demanded," Lazarus said. "San Francisco's population requires a high level of public service." By the time Feinstein left office, the city was spending \$17 million a year to contain the AIDS epidemic, a cost that could not have been contemplated when she became mayor in 1978.

Wilson's city faced neither an AIDS epidemic nor widespread homelessness, and he had no responsibility for social services or mental health programs. Under his leadership, the city cut property tax rates 25% even before Proposition 13. He pushed successfully for a local spending cap that was stricter than the statewide Gann limit passed by voters a year later.

During his tenure, city spending, adjusted for inflation and population growth, dropped, as did the number of city employees. The per

Please see MAYORS, A24

# MAYORS: Both Led Cities After Crises

Continued from A23

capita tax burden also declined. After Proposition 13, the city cut spending on libraries, parks and recreation. The bus system, which had been expanded to 45 routes, was chopped to 28. Maintenance was deferred.

Here is a look at how the two mayors handled other issues:

● **Crime.** Both mayors put a priority on public safety—each boosted the police budgets and added hundreds of officers to the departments—but with different results.

During Feinstein's tenure, serious crimes in San Francisco—murder, rape, robbery and others—declined by more than 20%. Under Wilson, San Diego's crime rate soared 25.5%, after accounting for the huge jump in the city's population. Despite the increase, San Diego's crime rate when Wilson left office remained the lowest among California's 10 largest cities.

● **Sewage.** Under the federal Clean Water Act, San Diego was required to upgrade its sewage disposal to so-called secondary treatment, which would remove about 90% of solids from waste water before it is dumped into the ocean. Wilson resisted the change, which at the time would have cost about \$500 million, with much of that paid by federal funds.

At Wilson's urging, the federal government granted the city a temporary waiver from the requirement, but later denied a permanent exemption. Meantime, the city abandoned backup plans for a new treatment plant. Now, San Diego is faced with a \$2.8-billion tab for the new plant, and the federal government is no longer willing to pitch in.

San Diego also neglected its existing sewage system during Wilson's years at the helm, according to current city officials. One pumping station in the north part of town was so overwhelmed by the volume of effluent dumped into it by the rapidly growing city that it often shut down, spilling raw sewage into a nearby lagoon 60 times in eight years. Other sewage failures forced the closure of parts

of Mission Bay for 27% of the time between 1980 and 1987.

San Francisco's sewage system was faced with similar problems, but the city handled it differently. As a supervisor, Feinstein supported a \$240-million bond measure approved by voters to repair the system and build treatment facilities. Because San Francisco acted quickly, the federal government paid the lion's share of the cost. After Feinstein became mayor, she fought a ballot initiative that tried to halt the project in midstream.

● **Growth management.** Both mayors governed during a time of rapid development. Feinstein's San Francisco was a magnet for commercial growth; Wilson was San Diego's leader during an unprecedented housing boom. Although both implemented some controls, both were accused by critics of catering to developers to maximize their campaign contributions.

Wilson calls himself one of the founders of growth management. But the blueprint he drew did not prevent freeway traffic jams that are among the worst in California, smog that exceeds state standards one day out of every three, and an inner-city area in need of nearly \$1 billion in public works projects. The city's population grew by 25% during Wilson's term, faster than the state as a whole.

Wilson's plan divided the city into three tiers and sought to channel most of the growth into areas closest to the city's urban core, where city services were in place. Some development was allowed on the city's edge, but builders were assessed fees to pay for much of the infrastructure their neighborhoods required. The third tier was to be left undeveloped for future generations.

To entice developers to build in the urban area, Wilson's plan exempted such construction from the fees charged elsewhere to support public works projects. Now, the city is \$900 million short of what is required to pay for the infrastructure—parks, libraries, sewers and streets—needed by those new residents. The City Council voted re-

cently to slap new fees on builders citywide.

Feinstein's problem was altogether different. With her encouragement, developers built about 25 million square feet of office space in the city, enough, by some estimates, to generate 100,000 additional office workers. Only about 1,000 housing units were built each year in the city. The median-priced home jumped from \$108,000 to \$262,000 during the 1980s.

Neighborhood groups demanded limits on commercial growth. They urged the city to require developers to help pay for new housing and parks and defray the cost of public transit that delivered workers to their buildings.

Calvin Welch, co-founder of a coalition of nonprofit developers of low-cost housing, said Feinstein refused to acknowledge that her policies were changing the character of the city for the worse—forcing middle-income workers to live in distant suburbs and forcing the poor to live on the streets.

"She never understood or refused to understand that the practical impact of her economic development policy was a housing crisis," Welch said. "We have gone from San Francisco to Manhattan. Life on the streets has become meaner and harder. It is not only more difficult to find a parking space, it is more difficult to find a neighbor."

In 1983, Feinstein proposed a "downtown plan" that sought to direct development to an area of warehouses and industry. The plan gave developers the right to build taller buildings south of Market Street in exchange for saving historical structures elsewhere. Over time, Feinstein added elements to force developers to pay for housing, transit and parks, and to provide child care. Under pressure from the Board of Supervisors, she agreed to limit office development to 950,000 square feet a year.

A month after the plan was adopted in 1986, voters, over Feinstein's objections, approved a ballot measure that cut the annual office limit in half.

# Separated at Birth?

LOS ANGELES—Sen. Pete Wilson and former San Francisco mayor Dianne Feinstein say they have known each other only 20 years or so, but I don't believe it. I think they are, in some mystical way, twins separated at birth to use a phrase popularized by Spy magazine.

California Democratic gubernatorial candidate Feinstein and her Republican opponent, Wilson, were chosen after extensive consultations and expensive primary elections as the best representatives of their parties' differing constituencies in the race for the most powerful state office in the country. Yet they are the same age (57), the same height (5-10), probably about the same weight (data in this category is heavily classified) and apparently agree on nearly every major national and international issue.

Feinstein and Wilson both established their political reputations as mayors of major port cities (San Francisco and San Diego) with relatively high-income populations. Both have long been at odds with activists in their own parties because they take mainstream positions (pro-death pen-



alty for Feinstein, pro-abortion rights for Wilson) that clash with their party organizations' innermost desires.

Both grew up in affluent homes, attended prestigious private high schools and colleges (Convent of the Sacred Heart and Stanford for Feinstein; Saint

Louis Country Day School and Yale for Wilson) and soon began careers in public service and government. Each has been divorced once (Feinstein has also been widowed). Each happily remarried in the early 1980s to spouses younger and wealthier than themselves.

Most of these are superficial similarities, I agree, but watch what happened when the Los Angeles Times, the West's largest and best endowed newspaper, tried to find contrasts in the basic Feinstein and Wilson approaches to life and work.

The story on Feinstein by Cathleen Decker and the one on Wilson by Bill Stall were models of depth, detail and aggressive reporting, but the habits revealed were so similar that the Times copy editor struggled to avoid running the same headline on each story: "Feinstein's Deliberative Style Tempers Decisions" said one headline. "Deliberate Wilson Relies on Experts, Longtime Aides" said the other. Wilson, Stall said, "pursues a process that is thorough, wide-ranging, painstaking in detail—and often frustrating to those who know him best." Feinstein, Decker said, is distinguished by "her

near-obsession with detail, with finding answers to searching questions about the issue at hand, even if that means appearing to publicly dawdle."

The Orange County Register, probing their personal tastes, found both candidates endorsed "hard work" as the secret to their success; and both thought an ideal day off included sleeping late and watching movies on the VCR.

Had enough? If American politics did not have two parties and human reproduction did not require two sexes, there might not be any fundamental differences between them at all.

It is an assumption bordering on a cliché that we Californians like to think ourselves ahead of the curve, eager to show the rest of the country what it will be eating, drinking and voting for in a year or two. Californians spend more money on polls, 30-second television spots and consultant fees than any other state. Perhaps all this money and effort has produced the formula for the ideal candidate—the balanced personality and cautious intellect guaranteed to guide any multilayered economy and



ASSOCIATED PRESS PHOTOS

multiethnic electorate smoothly and efficiently into the next century.

Then why aren't we happier about it? The primary turnout was low, and the general election is not expected to be much better. After complaining for

years about mediocre candidates and low-brow campaigns, why are we so unmoved by this bipartisan success at providing everything an intelligent, moderate voter might want? Is the golden mean, the goal of political philosophers for three millennia, a dead end? Is what we really want a race we can argue about with our neighbors?

Feinstein and Wilson deny, with their usual polite and well-chosen words, that they are that much alike. Feinstein is for the Big Green environmental initiative; Wilson is not. Wilson would support limits on legislative terms; Feinstein does not. Wilson is Methodist, Feinstein Jewish. Feinstein drinks cranapple juice, while Wilson sips Tab. But look closely at those differences, and they turn mushy—exceptions that prove the rule.

I cannot think of any gubernatorial race in the past 30 years with two candidates better equipped for office by temperament, intellect and experience. Approaching the ballot box, I know the state will be well led whichever one wins. I just wonder why the act of choosing no longer seems to be much fun.

*The writer is The Post's West Coast correspondent.*

October 13, 1990

# Wilson Misses Key Senate Abortion Vote to Campaign

■ **Governor's race:** His absence enables a parental-notification amendment, which he opposes, to avoid being killed. It now could become law.

By **BILL STALL** and **PAUL HOUSTON**  
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

Sen. Pete Wilson, under growing criticism for skipping U.S. Senate sessions while he campaigns for governor in California, missed a tie-breaking vote in Washington on Friday on a Senate amendment requiring parental notification in some abortions.

The provision, which Wilson opposes, now could become law.

The Senate failed on a 48-48 vote to kill the amendment by Sen. William L. Armstrong (R-Colo.), which would bar hospitals, doctors and other health care providers from receiving federal funds unless they give 48 hours' notice to parents of minors seeking abortions.

Otto Bos, Wilson's campaign director, said the Republican senator would have voted to table, or kill, the amendment had he been on the Senate floor.

After the effort to kill the Armstrong provision failed, the Senate attached the amendment by voice vote to an appropriations bill for the departments of Labor and Health and Human Services.

Lynda Schuler, Wilson's Senate press secretary, said "This thing came out of thin air. The senator has been told what happened, and he will work vigorously to have the bill killed in conference."

Wilson now has missed 42 recorded Senate votes since the August recess because he has been campaigning full time in California. Until now, he has argued that most of the votes he missed were inconsequential or "pro forma." And he has called it unproductive to be in Washington on the budget issue at this point while it is being hammered out behind the scenes by members of committees to which he does not belong.

On Friday, Wilson said he very likely would return to Washington next week for a final budget vote whether he supports or opposes whatever compromise is reached. Previously he said it would not be necessary to go to Washington if he decided to vote "no" on a budget measure, since being absent from the Senate floor is the same as casting a negative vote.

Also Friday, he said he is keeping posted on the negotiations for a new Clean Air Act by telephone with one of the Senate conference

committee members, Sen. John H. Chafee (R-R.I.). Several critical California issues are involved, including the control of air emissions from offshore oil rigs.

An official of the Clean Air Working Group, an industry lobby, said Wilson's absence does not matter much. A Sierra Club expert on the Clean Air Act said Wilson's firsthand assistance would be helpful. The club's California members have endorsed Feinstein for governor.

After Friday's abortion vote, Feinstein described Wilson as "missing in action."

"He said he would vote on any serious issue where his vote would tip the balance. Well, today he missed just such a vote. A woman's right to choose is a serious issue," Feinstein said in a statement. "And Pete Wilson's vote could have tipped the balance."

Bos said Wilson would have "another chance to vote on" the Armstrong amendment when the final version of the Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations bill reaches the Senate floor. But the usual procedure in such a case is to vote to accept or reject the entire bill and not specific provisions contained in it.

Wilson was "on standby to cast important votes . . . but we ate three time zones away, and on this one we were simply not able to see it coming so fast," Bos said.

Bos added: "With three weeks to go in the campaign, I think people [in California] want a person who's going to lead the state for the next decade to lay out his vision on what he wants to do with the state."

Earlier in the week, Wilson said he was keeping up with the budget debate through telephone calls with President Bush, White House Chief of Staff John H. Sununu and Sen. Bob Packwood of Oregon, the senior Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee.

On Friday, Wilson said he was "not enthused" about either Democratic or Republican tax proposals that were circulating Friday. He had not spoken to Bush in the last several days, he said.

Asked to comment on the President's handling of the confusing tax issue, Wilson said: "Well, I would have to say that it's been less than clear. All I know is what in fact has been reported, and there seems to be a good deal of indecision, which I hope will change."

Wilson went to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Academy on Friday to discuss anti-crime legislation and to challenge Feinstein to use her influence with state Assembly Speaker Willie Brown (D-San Francisco) to change the makeup of the Assembly Public Safety Committee. Wilson called the committee "the graveyard" of

Please see **WILSON, A34**

## WILSON: Senator Misses Abortion Vote While Campaigning Back Home

Continued from A28  
critically needed anti-crime legislation. But then he said there was no chance that Feinstein could wield that much influence over the Speaker, since she was, in fact, "beholden" to him.

Feinstein, meanwhile, began airing a 30-second television ad that closely resembles one that helped spark her victory in the Democratic primary June 6. It opens with live footage of a stricken Feinstein announcing the Nov. 27, 1978, shooting deaths of San Francisco Mayor George Moscone and Supervisor Harvey Milk—the event that propelled her into the mayor's office.

"Forged from tragedy, this woman's leadership triumphed over the fiscal trauma of Proposi-

tion 13," the ad says. It further praises Feinstein for balancing city budgets, cutting crime and building a modern sewer system.

There was a key change from a primary campaign version. A line that highlighted Feinstein's difference on the death penalty with primary opponent John K. Van de Kamp was changed to say "She's the only candidate for governor who will change California."

Stall reported from Los Angeles and Houston from Washington. Times political writer Cathleen Decker also contributed to this story.

For home delivery, call 1-800-LA TIMES. 1290

Photo Copy Preservation

SALE 799.95  
TRADITIONAL MARKET

To Carol

Date 10-24-90 Time 1:40

**WHILE YOU WERE OUT**

M Mel Lukens

of can be reached through

Phone Drvine signals.

Area Code	Number	Extension
TELEPHONED		PLEASE CALL
CALLED TO SEE YOU		WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU		URGENT

RETURNED YOUR CALL

Message L.A. Speech:

She will be at least 2 stars  
on stage w/POTUS:

Tom Sellick (Pledge of Alleg.)

Mel Journé (National Anthem)

Wendy  
Operator