



CONSOLIDATED GENERAL ELECTION

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2010

SAMPLE BALLOT AND INFORMATION PAMPHLET

VOTE-BY-MAIL

October 4 – 26

**APPLICATION
ON BACK COVER**

**LAST DAY TO
REGISTER TO VOTE**

October 18, 2010

**POLLING PLACE
LOCATION
ON BACK COVER**

Polls Open

**November 2, 2010
7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.**

POSTMARK NOT ACCEPTED

**IF YOU HAVE NOT MAILED YOUR VOTED BALLOT
BEFORE ELECTION DAY IT MAY BE DROPPED OFF
AT ANY POLLING PLACE IN THE COUNTY OR AT
THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE BY 8 P.M. ON
ELECTION DAY TO COUNT.**

AVISO IMPORTANTE

**Una traducción en Español de esta Boleta de Muestra y
Folleto de Información al Votante puede obtenerse en la
oficina del Registro de Votantes Llame al (951) 486-7200 o
1 (800) 773-VOTE (8683) o visite nuestra sitio
www.voteinfo.net**



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507 * 951-486-7200 * 800-773-VOTE (8683) * TTY: 951-697-8966
www.voteinfo.net



IMPORTANT NOTICE TO VOTERS

In an effort to maintain current voter rolls and reduce waste, the Riverside County Registrar of Voters will be mailing an alternate residency confirmation notice after the November 2, 2010 Consolidated General Election, pursuant to California Elections Code § 2224 that permits removal from the active voter roll the names of those registered voters who have **NOT** voted in any election nor had their registration updated in the preceding four years.

The pre-addressed return postage-paid card **MUST BE RETURNED** to the registrar of voters if he or she wish to remain on the active voter roll. However, if you receive a card for someone who has moved or does not live at the address shown return the card so that we can maintain a current voter file.

Voters who return the notice with an affirmative response will remain on the active list of registered voters.

Voters who do **NOT** respond affirmatively will be placed on an inactive voter list, and they will no longer receive election materials. If they fail to vote in any election between the time they receive the notice and the next two federal general elections, they may be canceled from the voter file.



VOTE EARLY

IT'S QUICK

IT'S EASY

IT'S CONVENIENT


**GET OUT OF LINE
ON ELECTION DAY!**

VOTE-BY-MAIL



Did You Know...

- Any voter can vote-by-mail
- You can opt to vote-by-mail once or chose to receive all future ballots by mail
- Vote-by-mail ballots are mailed to voters up to 29 days before Election Day
- A vote-by-mail voter can check online to see if the Registrar has received their ballot
- Vote-by-mail ballots can be returned:
 - * by mail
 - * at a vote-by-mail drop off box at any City Hall or County Library
 - * at any polling place in the County on Election Day
- The back of this pamphlet includes a vote-by-mail application



BARBARA DUNMORE
Registrar of Voters



2724 Gateway Drive
Riverside, CA 92507-0918
(951) 486-7200 • FAX (951) 486-7272
TTY (951) 697-8966
www.voteinfo.net

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

Dear Riverside County Voter:

The Consolidated General Election is November 2nd. Your ballot will contain contests for federal and state offices, as well as a number of statewide measures. In addition, your ballot may include local contests and measures. This Sample Ballot and Information Pamphlet and your State-issued Voter Information Guide are provided to assist you in making informed choices. You may mark your selections on your sample ballot for easy reference when completing your official ballot.

There are several options to cast your ballot in this election.



Polling Place Your polling place is listed on the back of this pamphlet. Polling places will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Election Day, November 2nd.



Registrar of Voters Office You may receive and cast your ballot (paper ballots and accessible voting unit available) at the Registrar of Voters Office located at 2724 Gateway Drive in Riverside, Monday – Saturday, beginning October 4th through the close of polls on Election Day. A drop box is located outside the front entrance for deposit of vote-by-mail ballots 24 hours a day.



Vote-by-Mail Any voter may request a vote-by-mail ballot and return it by mail at their convenience to reach the Registrar of Voters Office no later than the close of polls on Election Day. Postmarks are not accepted. Vote-by-mail ballots may also be turned in at any Riverside County polling place on Election Day.



Vote-by-Mail Drop-off Box Drop-off boxes for vote-by-mail ballots are available at county libraries and city clerks' offices beginning October 4th through November 1st.

You may confirm that you are registered to vote at www.voteinfo.net by selecting "Am I Registered?" The last day to register to vote and participate in this election is October 18, 2010.

You may confirm that the Registrar of Voters has received your returned vote-by-mail ballot at www.voteinfo.net by selecting "The Status of My Vote-by-Mail Ballot."

To ensure your ballot is counted promptly and accurately use a single line to connect the arrow and return your ballot by the close of polls (8 p.m.) on Election Day.

The ballot box is where we exercise our most cherished heritage and our proudest legacy – **the right to vote**. We look forward to counting your vote with your participation on November 2nd.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dunmore
Registrar of Voters

**CAN'T MAKE IT ON ELECTION DAY?
WE'RE MAKING IT EASY TO VOTE EARLY**



AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATION

THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507

October 4 through November 1
(excluding Holidays)

Monday through Friday
8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Saturdays
9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Election Day, November 2
7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.



VOTE-BY-MAIL

You can request your OFFICIAL VOTE-BY-MAIL BALLOT by using the application on the back of this sample ballot booklet. Return your vote-by-mail ballot by mail or for your convenience, at the following drop-off locations throughout Riverside County October 4 to November 1:

- City Clerks' Offices
- County-run Libraries (as listed)
- The Registrar of Voters Office up until close of polls on Election Day.
- The Registrar of Voters 24-hour Drop Box is available east of the main entry doors.
- At any polling place in Riverside County on Election Day.



Check out our website
for maps to all of the
drop-off locations
throughout
Riverside County at
WWW.VOTEINFO.NET
or
call our office at
951-486-7200 or
1-800-773-VOTE(8683)

CITIES

**Banning
Beaumont
Blythe
Calimesa
Canyon Lake
Cathedral City
Coachella
Corona
Desert Hot Springs
Eastvale
Hemet
Indian Wells
Lake Elsinore
La Quinta
Menifee
Moreno Valley
Murrieta
Norco
Palm Desert
Palm Springs
Perris
Rancho Mirage
Riverside
San Jacinto
Temecula
Wildomar**

COUNTY LIBRARIES

Anza	Lake Tamarisk
Calimesa	Mecca
Canyon Lake	Mission Trail
Cathedral City	Norco
Coachella	Nuvview
Desert Hot Springs	Palm Desert
Eastvale	Paloma Valley
El Cerrito	Perris
Glen Avon	Robidoux
Highgrove	Romoland
Home Gardens	San Jacinto
Idyllwild	Sun City
Indio	Temecula –Grace Mellman
La Quinta	Temecula Public Library
Lake Elsinore	Thousand Palms
Lakeside	Valle Vista
	Woodcrest



TO PROPERLY MARK YOUR OFFICIAL PAPER BALLOT

Please refer to the following instructions on how to properly complete your official ballot.

- ✓ Connect the head and tail of the arrow that points to your choice, like the example provided. Check both front and back of ballot for voting contests
- ✓ Use a black ball point pen. Do not use felt tip, red or gel ink
- ✓ One line connecting the arrow is preferred
- ✓ Vote for no more than the number of votes allowed in each contest (e.g. vote for one, vote for no more than two, etc.)
- ✓ Please keep the vote-by-mail ballot folded the same way you received it

TO MARK YOUR VOTE DRAW A LINE



**VERY IMPORTANT!!!
IF YOU ARE A VOTE-BY-MAIL VOTER, YOU MUST FILL OUT AND
SIGN YOUR RETURN ENVELOPE!**

For a demonstration on marking your ballot please visit our website at www.voteinfo.net

MAKE YOUR VOTE COUNT... MARK YOUR BALLOT CORRECTLY

EXAMPLE

CORRECT



INCORRECT



STATE/ESTADO		UNITED STATES SENATE SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS	
Governor / Gobernador	Vote for One Vote por Uno	United States Senator Senador De Los Estados Unidos	Vote for One Vote por Uno
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	CARLOS ALVAREZ Retail Worker Trabajador de ventas al por menor	American Independent Americano Independiente	EDWARD C. NOONAN Computer Store Owner Propietario de tienda de computación
Green Verde	LAURA WELLS Financial Systems Consultant Consultora de sistemas financieros	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	DUANE ROBERTS Community Volunteer Voluntario comunitario
Republican Republicano	MEG WHITMAN Businesswoman Empresaria	Libertarian Libertario	BARBARA BOXER United States Senator Senadora de Estados Unidos
Libertarian Libertario	DALE F. OGDEN Business Consultant/Actuary Consultor de empresas/Actuario	Green Verde	GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT Retired Nurse Enfermera jubilada
Democratic Demócrata	JERRY BROWN Attorney General of California Procurador General de California	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	MARSHA FEINLAND Retired Teacher Maestra jubilada
American Independent Americano Independiente	CHELENE NIGHTINGALE Business Owner Propietaria de empresa	Republican Republicano	CARLY FIORINA Business Executive Ejecutiva empresarial
Lieutenant Governor Vicegobernador	Vote for One Vote por Uno	UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS	Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	ABEL MALDONADO Senator/Businessman/Farmer Senador/Empresario/Agricultor	49th Congressional District Distrito Congresional Núm. 49	MIKE PASTER
Green Verde	JAMES "JIMI" CASTILLO Cultural Spiritual Advisor Asesor espiritual cultural	Libertarian Libertario	DARRELL ISSA Member, United States House of Representatives Miembro de la Cámara de Representantes de Estados Unidos
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	C. T. WEBER Retired Government Analyst Analista gubernamental jubilado	Republican Republicano	DION CLARK Electronic Engineer Ingeniero electrónico
American Independent Americano Independiente	JIM KING Real Estate Broker Corredor de bienes raíces	American Independent Americano Independiente	HOWARD KATZ Retired IT Manager Gerente de informática jubilado
Libertarian Libertario	PAMELA J. BROWN Economics Professor Profesora de economía	Democratic Demócrata	
Democratic Demócrata	GAVIN NEWSOM Mayor, City and County of San Francisco Alcalde, Ciudad y condado de San Francisco		
		STATE SENATOR SENADOR ESTATAL	

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

Secretary of State Secretario de Estado		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	DAMON DUNN Small Business Owner Propietario de pequeña empresa	↓
Libertarian Libertario	CHRISTINA TOBIN Voting Rights Advocate Defensora del derecho al voto	↓
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	MARYLOU CABRAL Community Volunteer Voluntaria comunitaria	↓
Democratic Demócrata	DEBRA BOWEN Secretary of State Secretaria de Estado	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	MERTON D. SHORT Aviator Aviador	↓
Green Verde	ANN MENASCHE Civil Rights Attorney Abogada de derechos civiles	↓
Controller / Contralor		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	KAREN MARTINEZ Retired Jubilada	↓
Democratic Demócrata	JOHN CHIANG Controller Contralor	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	LAWRENCE G. BELIZ Independent Businessman Empresario independiente	↓
Green Verde	ROSS D. FRANKEL Accountant Contador	↓
Libertarian Libertario	ANDREW "ANDY" FAVOR Certified Public Accountant Contador público certificado	↓
Republican Republicano	TONY STRICKLAND State Senator/Businessman Senador estatal/Empresario	↓

Insurance Commissioner Comisionado de Seguros		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	DINA JOSEPHINE PADILLA Injured Worker Consultant Consultora de trabajadores lesionados	↓
Libertarian Libertario	RICHARD S. BRONSTEIN Licensed Insurance Broker Corredor de seguros autorizado	↓
Green Verde	WILLIAM BALDERSTON Teacher/Union Organizer Maestro/Organizador sindical	↓
Democratic Demócrata	DAVE JONES Member, California State Assembly Miembro, Asamblea del Estado de California	↓
Republican Republicano	MIKE VILLINES Businessman/State Assemblyman Empresario/Asambleísta del Estado	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	CLAY PEDERSEN Retail Manager Gerente de ventas al por menor	↓
Member, State Board of Equalization District 3 Miembro de la Directiva de Impuestos Sobre Ventas, Uso y Otros Distrito 3		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	MICHELLE STEEL Member, Board of Equalization Miembro, Directiva de Impuestos Sobre Ventas, Uso y Otros	↓
Libertarian Libertario	JERRY L. DIXON Certified Public Accountant Contador público certificado	↓
Democratic Demócrata	MARY CHRISTIAN HEISING Retired Businesswoman Empresaria jubilada	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	TERRI LUSSENHEIDE Home School Teacher Maestra escolar hogareña	↓
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	MARY LOU FINLEY Special Education Assistant Asistente de educación especial	↓

36th Senatorial District Distrito Senatorial Núm. 36		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	JOEL ANDERSON Assemblymember Miembro de la Asamblea	↓
Democratic Demócrata	PAUL CLAY Teacher Maestro	↓
Libertarian Libertario	MICHAEL S. METTI	↓
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA DEL ESTADO		Vote for One Vote por Uno
66th Assembly District Distrito de la Asamblea Núm. 66		↓
Republican Republicano	KEVIN D. JEFFRIES Business Owner/Assemblyman Propietario de empresa/Asambleísta	↓
Democratic Demócrata	DOUGLAS P. DYE Retired Engineer Ingeniero jubilado	↓
JUDICIAL / JUDICIAL VOTE YES OR NO FOR EACH OFFICE VOTE SÍ O NO POR CADA OFICINA		YES Sí
FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF CALIFORNIA POR JEZ PRESIDENTE DE CALIFORNIA		NO No
Shall Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, TANI G. CANTIL- SAKAUYE be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE , Juez Asociada de la Corte de Apelación del Tercer Distrito de Apelaciones, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?		

CA33-1-084

(2AZ1)

JUDICIAL / JUDICIAL VOTE YES OR NO FOR EACH OFFICE VOTE SI O NO POR CADA OFICINA	
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT POR JUEZ ASOCIADO DE LA CORTE SUPREMA	
Shall Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, MING W. CHIN be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá MING W. CHIN , Juez Asociado de la Corte Suprema, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	
YES SÍ	☐
NO NO	☐
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT POR JUEZ ASOCIADO DE LA CORTE SUPREMA	
Shall Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, CARLOS R. MORENO be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá CARLOS R. MORENO , Juez Asociado de la Corte Suprema, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	
YES SÍ	☐
NO NO	☐
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 1 POR JUEZ PRESIDENTE, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 1	
Shall Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 1, JUDITH D. MCCONNELL be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá JUDITH D. MCCONNELL , Juez Presidente de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 1, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	
YES SÍ	☐
NO NO	☐
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 2 POR JUEZ PRESIDENTE, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 2	
Shall Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 2, MANUEL A. RAMIREZ be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá MANUEL A. RAMIREZ , Juez Presidente de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 2, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	
YES SÍ	☐
NO NO	☐
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 2 POR JUEZ ASOCIADO, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 2	

SCHOOL / ESCOLAR	
Superintendent of Public Instruction Superintendente de Instrucción Pública	
Vote for One Vote por Uno	☐
LARRY ACEVES Retired School Superintendent Superintendente escolar jubilado	☐
TOM TORLAKSON Teacher/California Legislator Maestro/Legislador de California	☐
☐	☐
COUNTY / CONDADO	
Auditor-Controller / Auditor-Contralor	
Vote for One Vote por Uno	☐
PAUL ANGULO Certified Public Accountant Contador público certificado	☐
IVAN M. CHAND District Finance Director Director de Finanzas del distrito	☐
☐	☐
CITY / CIUDAD	
CITY OF MURRIETA CIUDAD DE MURRIETA	
City Council Member Miembro del Concejo Municipal	
Vote for no more than Three Vote por no más de Tres	☐
EMILIA RYCHENER Non-Profit Consultant Consultora sin fines de lucro	☐
GARY THOMASIAN Business Owner / Councilman Proprietario de empresa / Concejál	☐
RICK GIBBS Councilmember / Businessman Concejál / Empresario	☐
DOUGLAS V. GIBBS Truck Driver / Columnist Chofer de camión / Columnista	☐
KELLY A. BENNETT Mayor / Councilwoman / Attorney Alcalde / Concejál / Abogada	☐
SUSAN A. VOMBAUR Registered Civil Engineer Ingeniero civil titulado	☐
ALAN LONG Fire Captain / Paramedic Capitán de bomberos / Auxiliar médico	☐

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR



RV 084-007

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

CA33-2-AZ1

Shall Judge of the Superior Court of Riverside County CAROL D. CODRINGTON be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá CAROL D. CODRINGTON, Juez de la Corte Superior del Condado de Riverside, ser elegida a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	YES Sí	NO NO
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 3 POR JUEZ PRESIDENTE, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 3		
Shall Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 3, DAVID G. SILLS be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá DAVID G. SILLS, Juez Presidente de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 3, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	YES Sí	NO NO
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 3 POR JUEZ ASOCIADO, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 3		
Shall Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 3, WILLIAM W. BEDSWORTH be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá WILLIAM W. BEDSWORTH, Juez Asociado de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 3, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	YES Sí	NO NO
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 3 POR JUEZ ASOCIADO, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 3		
Shall Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 3, EILEEN C. MOORE be elected to the office for the term provided by law? ¿Deberá EILEEN C. MOORE, Juez Asociada de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 3, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el periodo que dispone la ley?	YES Sí	NO NO
DAVID F. LANDRISCINA Power Plant Operator Operador de planta de energía		

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS / MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS A LOS VOTANTES

STATE / ESTADO

19

LEGALIZES MARIJUANA UNDER CALIFORNIA BUT NOT FEDERAL LAW. PERMITS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO REGULATE AND TAX COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND SALE OF MARIJUANA. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows people 21 years old or older to possess, cultivate, or transport marijuana for personal use. Fiscal Impact: Depending on federal, state, and local government actions, potential increased tax and fee revenues in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually and potential correctional savings of several tens of millions of dollars annually.

LEGALIZA LA MARIHUANA SEGÚN LA LEY DE CALIFORNIA, PERO NO LA LEY FEDERAL. PERMITE QUE LOS GOBIERNOS LOCALES REGULEN Y GRAVEN LA PRODUCCIÓN COMERCIAL, DISTRIBUCIÓN Y VENTA DE MARIHUANA. LEY POR INICIATIVA. Permite que las personas de 21 años de edad o mayores posean, cultiven o transporten marihuana para uso personal. Impacto fiscal: Dependiendo de los actos gubernamentales federales, estatales y locales, posible aumento de las recaudaciones impositivas y de cargos de cientos de millones de dólares anuales y posibles ahorros para correccionales de varias decenas de millones de dólares anuales.

YES

SI

NO

NO

20

REDISTRICTING OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Removes elected representatives from process of establishing congressional districts and transfers that authority to recently-authorized 14-member redistricting commission comprised of Democrats, Republicans, and representatives of neither party. Fiscal Impact: No significant net change in state redistricting costs.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTRITOS DEL CONGRESO. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL POR INICIATIVA. Retira a los representantes elegidos por votación del proceso de establecer distritos del Congreso y transfiere esa autoridad a la comisión de 14 miembros recientemente autorizada a redistribuir distritos, formada por demócratas, republicanos y representantes de ninguno de esos dos partidos. Impacto fiscal: Sin cambios netos significativos para el estado en los costos de redistribución de distritos.

YES

SI

NO

NO

21

ESTABLISHES \$18 ANNUAL VEHICLE LICENSE SURCHARGE TO HELP FUND STATE PARKS AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS. GRANTS SURCHARGED VEHICLES FREE ADMISSION TO ALL STATE PARKS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Exempts commercial vehicles, trailers and trailer coaches from the surcharge. Fiscal Impact: Annual increase to state revenues of \$500 million from surcharge on vehicle registrations. After offsetting some existing funding sources, these revenues would provide at least \$250 million more annually for state parks and wildlife conservation.

ESTABLECE UN RECARGO ANUAL DE \$18 SOBRE LAS MATRÍCULAS DE LOS VEHÍCULOS PARA AYUDAR A FINANCIAR LOS PARQUES ESTATALES Y LOS PROGRAMAS DE VIDA SILVESTRE. CONCEDE ENTRADA GRATUITA A TODOS LOS PARQUES ESTATALES A LOS VEHÍCULOS QUE PAGARON EL RECARGO. LEY POR INICIATIVA. Exime del recargo a los vehículos comerciales, los remolques y los camper. Impacto fiscal: Aumento anual de las recaudaciones del estado de \$500 millones proveniente del recargo sobre las matrículas de los vehículos. Después de contrarrestar algunas fuentes de financiamiento existentes, esas recaudaciones proporcionarían al menos \$250 millones anuales más para los parques estatales y la conservación de la vida silvestre.

YES

SI

NO

NO

22

PROHIBITS THE STATE FROM BORROWING OR TAKING FUNDS USED FOR TRANSPORTATION, REDEVELOPMENT, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS AND SERVICES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Prohibits State, even during severe fiscal hardship, from delaying distribution of tax revenues for these purposes. Fiscal Impact: Decreased state General Fund spending and/or increased state revenues, probably in the range of \$1 billion to several billions of dollars annually. Comparable increases in funding for state and local transportation programs and local redevelopment.

PROHIBE QUE EL ESTADO TOME EN PRESTAMO O SE APODERE DE FONDOS DESTINADOS A TRANSPORTE, REURBANIZACIÓN O PROYECTOS Y SERVICIOS DE GOBIERNOS LOCALES. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL POR INICIATIVA. Prohíbe que el Estado, incluso en épocas de grandes dificultades fiscales, aplase la distribución de recaudaciones impositivas para estos fines. Impacto fiscal: Menor gasto del Fondo General del estado y/o mayores recaudaciones impositivas del estado, probablemente de entre \$1,000 millones a varios miles de millones de dólares anuales. Aumentos de financiamiento comparables para programas de transporte estatales y locales y la reurbanización local.

YES

SI

NO

NO

23

SUSPENDS IMPLEMENTATION OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAW (AB 32) REQUIRING MAJOR SOURCES OF EMISSIONS TO REPORT AND REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS THAT CAUSE GLOBAL WARMING, UNTIL UNEMPLOYMENT DROPS TO 5.5 PERCENT OR LESS FOR FULL YEAR. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Fiscal Impact: Likely modest net increase in overall economic activity in the state from suspension of greenhouse gases regulatory activity, resulting in a potentially significant net increase in state and local revenues.

SUSPENDE LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE LA LEY DE CONTROL DE LA CONTAMINACIÓN DEL AIRE (AB 32) QUE REQUIERE QUE LAS PRINCIPALES FUENTES DE EMISIONES REPORTEN Y REDUZCAN LAS EMISIONES DE GASES DE EFECTO INVERNADERO QUE CAUSAN EL CALENTAMIENTO GLOBAL HASTA QUE EL DESEMPEÑO BAJE AL 5.5 POR CIENTO O MENOS POR UN AÑO COMPLETO. LEY POR INICIATIVA. Impacto fiscal: Probablemente un aumento neto modesto de la actividad económica general en el estado proveniente de la suspensión de la actividad de regulación de los gases de efecto invernadero que podría resultar en un aumento neto significativo de las recaudaciones estatales y locales.

YES	↓
SÍ	↓
NO	↓
NO	↓

24

REPEALS RECENT LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW BUSINESSES TO LOWER THEIR TAX LIABILITY. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues of about \$1.3 billion each year by 2012-13 from higher taxes paid by some businesses. Smaller increases in 2010-11 and 2011-12.

DEROGA LEGISLACIÓN RECIENTE QUE PERMITIRÍA QUE LAS EMPRESAS REDUZIERAN SU OBLIGACIÓN TRIBUTARIA. LEY POR INICIATIVA. Impacto fiscal: Mayores recaudaciones estatales de unos \$1,300 millones anuales para 2012-13 provenientes de impuestos más elevados que pagarían algunas empresas. Menores aumentos en 2010-11 y 2011-12.

YES	↓
SÍ	↓
NO	↓
NO	↓

25

CHANGES LEGISLATIVE VOTE REQUIREMENT TO PASS BUDGET AND BUDGET-RELATED LEGISLATION FROM TWO-THIRDS TO A SIMPLE MAJORITY. RETAINS TWO-THIRDS VOTE REQUIREMENT FOR TAXES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Legislature permanently forfeits daily salary and expenses until budget bill passes. Fiscal Impact: In some years, the contents of the state budget could be changed due to the lower legislative vote requirement in this measure. The extent of changes would depend on the Legislature's future actions.

CAMBIA EL REQUISITO DE VOTO LEGISLATIVO PARA APROBAR EL PRESUPUESTO Y LEGISLACIÓN RELACIONADA CON EL PRESUPUESTO DE LAS DOS TERCERAS PARTES A UNA MAYORÍA SIMPLE. MANTIENE EL REQUISITO DE LAS DOS TERCERAS PARTES DEL VOTO PARA IMPUESTOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL POR INICIATIVA. La Legislatura pierde permanentemente salario diario y gastos hasta que aprueba el proyecto de ley presupuestaria. Impacto fiscal: En algunos años el contenido del presupuesto del estado podría cambiar a causa del requisito de voto legislativo reducido de esta medida. El alcance de los cambios dependería de los actos futuros de la Legislatura.

YES	↓
SÍ	↓
NO	↓
NO	↓

26

REQUIRES THAT CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL FEES BE APPROVED BY TWO-THIRDS VOTE. FEES INCLUDE THOSE THAT ADDRESS ADVERSE IMPACTS ON SOCIETY OR THE ENVIRONMENT CAUSED BY THE FEE-PAYER'S BUSINESS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Fiscal Impact: Depending on decisions by governing bodies and voters, decreased state and local government revenues and spending (up to billions of dollars annually). Increased transportation spending and state General Fund costs (\$1 billion annually).

REQUIERE QUE CIERTAS CUOTAS ESTATALES Y LOCALES SEAN APROBADAS POR EL VOTO DE LAS DOS TERCERAS PARTES. LAS CUOTAS INCLUYEN LAS QUE ESTÁN DIRIGIDAS A IMPACTOS ADVERSOS SOBRE LA SOCIEDAD O EL MEDIO AMBIENTE CAUSADOS POR LAS ACTIVIDADES COMERCIALES DE LOS QUE PAGAN CUOTAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL POR INICIATIVA. Impacto fiscal: Dependiendo de las decisiones de los organismos gubernamentales y de los votantes, menores recaudaciones y gastos de los gobiernos estatal y locales (de hasta miles de millones de dólares anuales). Mayores gastos en transporte y mayores costos del Fondo General del estado (\$1,000 millones anuales).

YES	↓
SÍ	↓
NO	↓
NO	↓

CA33-3



MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS / MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS A LOS VOTANTES

STATE / ESTADO

27

ELIMINATES STATE COMMISSION ON REDISTRICTING. CONSOLIDATES AUTHORITY FOR REDISTRICTING WITH ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Eliminates 14-member redistricting commission. Consolidates authority for establishing state Assembly, Senate, and Board of Equalization districts with elected representatives who draw congressional districts. Fiscal Impact: Possible reduction of state redistricting costs of around \$1 million over the next year. Likely reduction of these costs of a few million dollars once every ten years beginning in 2020.

ELIMINA LA COMISIÓN ESTATAL DE REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTRITOS. CONSOLIDA LA AUTORIDAD DE REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTRITOS EN REPRESENTANTES ELEGIDOS POR VOTACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL Y LEY POR INICIATIVA. Elimina la comisión de 14 miembros de redistribución de distritos. Consolida la autoridad de establecer distritos para la Asamblea estatal, el Senado y la Directiva de Impuestos sobre Ventas, Uso y Otros en representantes elegidos por votación encargados de trazar distritos del Congreso. Impacto fiscal: Posible reducción de los costos del estado de redistribución de distritos de cerca de \$1 millón a lo largo del próximo año. Probable reducción de estos costos de varios millones de dólares una vez cada diez años a partir de 2020.

YES
Sí

NO
NO

COUNTY / CONDADO

K

Shall Ordinance No. 10-002, amending RCTC's existing 2002 voter-approved ordinance to expedite construction of the following types of transportation projects:

- Widen freeways including State Routes 91, 71, 79, and Interstates 10, 15, 215
- Widen and improve major streets
- Expand Metrolink commuter train services

by increasing bonded indebtedness from \$500 to \$975 million of estimated receipts from the Measure A program, without increasing taxes, be approved?

¿Deberá ser aprobada la Ordenanza No. 10-002, que enmienda la ordenanza existente de la RCTC, aprobada por los votantes en 2002 para acelerar la construcción de los siguientes tipos de proyectos de transporte:

- Ampliar las autopistas, incluyendo las rutas estatales 91, 71, 79 e interestatales 10, 15, 215
- Ampliar y mejorar las calles principales
- Expandir los servicios Metrolink de ferrocarriles de cercanías aumentando el endeudamiento de bonos de \$500 a \$975 millones de los ingresos estimados provenientes del programa de la Medida A, sin aumentar los impuestos?

YES
Sí

NO
NO

L

Shall the proposed Ordinance, requiring voter approval for increases or decreases in public safety employee retirement or pre-retirement death benefits and requiring that the County of Riverside continue the current CALPERS (California Public Employee Retirement System) retirement formula, be adopted?

¿Deberá ser adoptada la Ordenanza propuesta, que requiere aprobación de los votantes para incrementos o reducciones en los beneficios de jubilación de los empleados de seguridad pública o por muerte antes de la jubilación, y que requiere que el Condado de Riverside continúe usando la fórmula actual de jubilación de CALPERS (Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos de California)?

YES
Sí

NO
NO

M

Shall Ordinance No. 899, requiring voter approval for increases in public safety employee retirement benefits or decreases in job related pre-retirement death benefits, and allowing decreases in retirement benefits, be adopted?

¿Deberá ser adoptada la Ordenanza No. 899, que requiere aprobación de los votantes para incrementos en los beneficios de jubilación de los empleados de seguridad pública o para la disminución de beneficios relacionados con el trabajo por muerte antes de la jubilación, y que permite la disminución de beneficios de jubilación?

YES
Sí

NO
NO

CA33-4-F1

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

CITY / CIUDAD	
CITY OF MURRIETA / CIUDAD DE MURRIETA	
C Shall the ordinance prohibiting elected officials of the City of Murrieta and any of its political subdivisions from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms in office, with terms considered consecutive if they are at least four years apart, be adopted? ¿Deberá ser adoptada la ordenanza que prohíbe que los funcionarios elegidos por votación de la Ciudad de Murrieta y de todas sus subdivisiones políticas sirvan más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en sus cargos, los períodos siendo considerados como consecutivos si están separados por lo menos cuatro años?	YES SÍ NO NO
D Shall the ordinance placing limits on City Council compensation to 15% of the City's annual median family/household income (exclusive of any amounts payable as reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their official City duties); prohibiting City Council members from receiving any other personal benefits, including club memberships, medical and life insurance and pensions; and requiring that any increase be approved by 55% of the registered voters be adopted? ¿Deberá ser adoptada la ordenanza que limita la remuneración de los miembros del Concejo Municipal al 15% del ingreso anual medio familiar/por vivienda de la Ciudad (exclusivo de cualquier monto pagadero como reembolso por gastos reales y necesarios incurridos en el desempeño de sus obligaciones oficiales para la Ciudad), que prohíbe que los miembros del Concejo Municipal reciban ningún otro beneficio personal, incluyendo afiliaciones a clubes, seguros médico y de vida y pensiones, y que requiere que todos los aumentos sean aprobados por el 55% de los votantes registrados?	YES SÍ NO NO
E Shall the ordinance prohibiting chief City administrative officials, including the City Manager and their direct reports (but excluding fire, police and other emergency public safety personnel), from having either annual salaries with benefits or a combined hourly rate with overtime and benefits (including, but not limited to, car, gas, life insurance, health/medical insurance, and other personal usage benefits) that exceeds 2.5 times the median family/household income in the City be adopted? ¿Deberá ser adoptada la ordenanza que prohíbe que los principales funcionarios administrativos de la Ciudad, incluyendo el administrador municipal y sus subalternos directos (pero excluyendo el personal de bomberos, policía y otro personal de seguridad pública de emergencia) tengan ya sea sueldos anuales con prestaciones o un pago por hora combinado con horas extras y prestaciones (incluyendo, pero no limitado a, carro, gasolina, seguro de vida, seguro de salud/médico y otros beneficios de uso personal) que exceda 2.5 veces el ingreso medio familiar/por vivienda en la Ciudad?	YES SÍ NO NO

CA33-4-F1



VOTER'S PAMPHLET INFORMATION SECTION

The following pages contain voter information applicable to your ballot which may include the following items:

- CANDIDATE STATEMENTS
- BALLOT MEASURES
- ANALYSES
- ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT & IN OPPOSITION
- TEXT OF MEASURES

This pamphlet section may not contain a complete list of candidates. A complete list of candidates appears on the Sample Ballot section of this pamphlet. Each candidate's statement in this pamphlet is volunteered by the candidate and is printed at the expense of the candidate unless otherwise determined by the governing body. Deposit amounts required for publication of candidate statements are listed at www.voteinfo.net.

Statements made on the following pages represent the views of the authors and are not endorsed by the County of Riverside. Internet web site addresses included in any statements are provided by the authors. The County of Riverside assumes no liability for the accuracy or content of web sites listed therein.

Arguments in support of or in opposition to the ballot measures are opinions of the authors.

The text, grammar, and spelling are as submitted by the authors.

Campaign Finance Reform

Among all state legislative candidates appearing on ballots in Riverside County, the following persons have pledged to abide by campaign spending limits as specified in the California Government Code. Candidates agreeing to the limits have the opportunity to publish a statement of qualifications in the local sample ballot pamphlet.

This list covers all legislative districts in the County. Not all districts will appear on your ballot.

STATE SENATE, 36TH DISTRICT

Paul Clay, Democratic
Joel Anderson, Republican

STATE ASSEMBLY, 65TH DISTRICT

Carl Wood, Democratic
Paul Cook, Republican

STATE SENATE, 40TH DISTRICT

Juan Vargas, Democratic
Brian Hendry, Republican

STATE ASSEMBLY, 66TH DISTRICT

Douglas P. Dye, Democratic
Kevin D. Jeffries, Republican

STATE ASSEMBLY, 63RD DISTRICT

Renea Wickman, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 71ST DISTRICT

Gary Kephart, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 64TH DISTRICT

Jose Medina, Democratic
Brian Nestande, Republican

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE,
49TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT**

DARRELL ISSA, Republican

OCCUPATION: Representative in Congress

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

It is my honor to represent you in Congress. I believe the most important thing I can do is to bring transparency and accountability to our nation's government.

I strongly opposed using your tax dollars to bail out Wall Street banks and the trillions of dollars of "stimulus" and other wasteful spending that followed. Taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill for irresponsible investment decisions on Wall Street, and government spending is not an effective tool for job creation in the private sector. Our policies should support the growth of jobs and small businesses, not government.

As the Republican leader of the House Oversight & Government Reform Committee, I have conducted investigations targeting waste, fraud and abuse in government and corrupt practices in corporate America.

Our investigations exposed attempts by taxpayer funded organizations to corrupt our electoral system; improper loan deals given to Congressman and Senators through the Countrywide Mortgage VIP program; misuse of bailout funds by the Federal Reserve; and mismanagement and corruption at the Minerals and Management Service, the federal agency responsible for regulating offshore drilling.

I hope to continue to serve you in Congress and would appreciate your vote.

For more information, please visit my website
www.issaforcongress.com or call my office at (760) 598-3535.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
STATE SENATOR,
36TH SENATORIAL DISTRICT**

JOEL ANDERSON, Republican

OCCUPATION: Assemblymember

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

During my short time in Sacramento, I've fought hard to fix a state government that is both broken and ignoring the needs of the citizens it represents.

To improve the economy and CREATE NEW JOBS, I put my business experience to work. I supported tax incentives that will help small businesses create thousands of new California jobs in the coming two years.

I also worked to eliminate excessive regulations on small businesses.

My pro-jobs record earned me 100% ratings from the California Chamber of Commerce. My opposition to job killing tax hikes earned me 100% ratings from the California Taxpayers Association.

To FIX CALIFORNIA'S BUDGET MESS, I fought the reckless spending, worked to put a strict cap on state spending and backed efforts to establish a rainy day reserve.

To stop wasting billions on illegal immigration, I co-authored a measure to end "sanctuary cities" that harbor illegal immigrants, and worked to DEPORT ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT CRIMINALS.

To FIGHT FRAUD and SAVE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, I helped mandate fingerprinting and background checks for aid recipients. I pushed for welfare reforms that SAVED BILLIONS while protecting children, the elderly and disabled.

My efforts to keep communities safe earned me honors as "LEGISLATOR OF THE YEAR" FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION and the San Diego Deputy District Attorneys' Association.

The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, California Association of Highway Patrolmen and California Small Business Association all support my candidacy.

Join my fight to clean up Sacramento, by visiting:
www.taxfightersforanderson.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
STATE SENATOR,
36TH SENATORIAL DISTRICT**

PAUL CLAY, Democratic

OCCUPATION: Teacher

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

AGE: 52

This election is about fixing California. The education system, the budgetary system, and the election system in California are all broken, and it is time to elect new leaders in our Legislature who will correct years of neglect. This is perhaps the gravest period in our State's history since the Great Depression, and what is needed is a State Senator who will think outside the box and act with courage and leadership. That is why I am running for this office.

Jobs need to be created, and Riverside County is uniquely situated to develop clean, green industries that can help wean us away from our wasteful dependency on foreign oil. We can generate 50,000 new jobs in the manufacturing of solar and wind generators, and other alternate energy sources. These jobs will be high-paid research and design, manufacturing positions that will provide a good income for the employees.

I was born in California and I am a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, Madison (BA) and National University (Teachers Certification.) I teach History, with a goal of instilling in my students the duties and responsibilities of each citizen to contribute to our society.

Please help me win back California. Visit my website at
www.paulclay2010.org Thank you.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY,
66TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT**

KEVIN D. JEFFRIES, Republican

AGE: 49

OCCUPATION: Business Owner / Assemblyman

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

Just a few years ago, I campaigned door-to-door for the privilege of representing you in the California State Assembly. During that time I made a commitment that I would work to reform our state government and to OPPOSE any effort to raise your taxes. I'm proud to say I have kept those commitments.

While serving you in the Assembly, I have been fighting to return California to a pro-jobs / pro-small business environment. In fact my voting record has earned some of the highest grades possible from respected groups like the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, California Taxpayers Association, California Farm Bureau and the California Chamber of Commerce.

I have introduced and fought for numerous reform proposals to stop the midnight votes, increase public oversight, eliminate unnecessary positions, cut regulations, and to streamline and consolidate state agencies. I fought against the early release of convicted felons into our communities and I opposed increasing your DMV fees and the use of your hard earned tax dollars to fund benefits for those who have entered our country illegally.

As a fiscal conservative, small business owner, family man, long time resident and Volunteer Fire Captain, I have been unwavering in the fight to protect taxpayers, families, jobs and our homes. I believe your hard earned tax dollars should be spent wisely. Our state government is broke because of its spending addiction and misguided priorities, NOT because you are failing to pay enough taxes.

I respectfully ask for your vote.

Kevin Jeffries

www.KevinJeffries.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

IVAN M. CHAND

AGE: 50

OCCUPATION: Finance Director

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

I'd like to thank everyone who voted for me in the June election. Your support resulted in an overwhelming victory in which I earned over 44% of the vote, making me the leading vote getter by a large margin. Now in a run-off election, I need your vote one more time so I can protect our tax dollars as your County Auditor-Controller.

Fiscal Responsibility

My top priority is to protect taxpayer dollars. Local government must end its addiction to unnecessary spending. I believe in balanced budgets that do not raise taxes or increase debt.

The Right Experience

My professional experience in finance, auditing, debt management, and investments uniquely qualifies me to serve as your Auditor-Controller during these difficult times. In my 25 years of service I have been your Assistant Auditor-Controller, County Flood Control District Finance Director, and Riverside County Transportation Commission Chief Financial Officer.

I've lived in Riverside County for over 30 years, have an accounting degree from La Sierra University, a Masters in Public Administration, and am a Certified Government Financial Manager.

Holding Government Accountable

I will work diligently to make the financial dealings of Riverside County more accountable and transparent.

I would greatly appreciate your vote.

www.chandforcountyauditor.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

PAUL ANGULO

AGE: 58

OCCUPATION: Certified Public Accountant

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

As your Auditor, I will provide strong leadership—bringing 25 years of private industry business experience that has taught me to listen, ask the right questions, and be proactive. Additionally, 8 years in the Auditor-Controller's Office has given me a clear understanding of its operations and essential functions. I will create an environment that ensures fiscal responsibility and accountability; and, I will bring unyielding ethics and integrity.

Action Plan

- Reduce Fraud through Steadfast Auditing
- Reduce Wasteful Spending and Abuse of Resources
- Reduce Labor Costs by Implementing Quality Controls and Streamlining Processes
- Improve Organizational Effectiveness through Root Cause Analyses of Systemic Failures
- Improve Transparency by forming a Citizens Oversight Committee
- Implement the Repair and Replacement Schedule Mandated by Law

Professional Experience

- Certified Public Accountant
- 8 Years Auditor-Controller's Office—Current
- 25 Years Private Industry Business and Management Experience
- University of Redlands, Masters—Management
- UC Berkeley, Bachelors—Political Science/Government
- US ARMY Veteran, Special Forces Trained Engineer

I am the best candidate because I am a licensed CPA with wide-ranging business experience and have been fighting for you since I joined the US Army in 1971.

Endorsed by the Riverside County Volunteer Firefighters Association
Critical issues on: www.paulangulo.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

EMILIA RYCHENER AGE: 40
OCCUPATION: Non-Profit Consultant / B.S. in Bus Administration
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

Emilia Rychener believes in upholding the rights of every American voter and will support and defend the Constitution of the United States. She is a proud long-time resident of Murrieta and ran for Murrieta City Council as a write-in candidate in 2008. She has chosen to run for Murrieta City Council again, to stand for justice and fair government practices within our city and to insure the best interest of Murrieta residents and small businesses. She is a strong supporter of the Murrieta Initiatives; elected official term-limits, limits on city council compensation and limits on city administration compensation. Murrieta taxpayers deserve a city administration reflective of its community and that serves the people of Murrieta above all else. As your elected city council official and a graduate with a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration I will work diligently to bring jobs to Murrieta, economic growth and bring transparency of our city to you.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

GARY THOMASIAN AGE: 58
OCCUPATION: Small Business Owner / Councilman
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

As I complete my first term on the Murrieta City Council, I am proud to report that I have successfully implemented my goals to bring respect, cooperation, and fiscal transparency to city hall.

Despite difficult economic times, we continue to have one of the safest cities in the nation. I've worked with national, state and local officials to address our local health care shortage, and Loma Linda University Medical Center, Murrieta will soon open.

My effort to create a diversified economic base with new jobs and increased revenues without additional taxes or costs to residents will continue.

By securing federal and state monies, local taxpayers have saved millions of dollars as we build new bridges over freeways and creeks.

Through community partnerships, Murrieta residents continue to enjoy the Birthday Bash, Santa Visits, Father's Day Car Show and activities at our Senior Center.

I've worked to increase park and open space, including the new equestrian center on the west side and a 454 acre addition of open space in the Los Alamos area.

I ask for your vote so that Murrieta may continue on the path of providing its residents with a quality of life that is second to none.

www.councilmanthomasian.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

RICK GIBBS AGE: 64
OCCUPATION: Councilmember / Businessman
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

Your 2006 vote confirmed you wanted me to maintain our Quality of Life while bringing jobs to Murrieta. As your Mayor in 2008, confronting a failing economy in severe recession and a massive foreclosure crisis, we tightened our belts. Today, Murrieta has made prudent decisions for a successful future: reducing the size of government, balancing our budget, preserving our 25% emergency reserve fund, maintaining one of the safest cities in the nation, and creating new jobs. As your champion for economic growth, here are the results: the Loma Linda University Medical Center — Murrieta will provide 500 new jobs by early next year; Super Target hired 250; and BMW will bring 100 jobs with its 2011 opening. The primary task of a council member is to listen and quickly respond to each individual. I have done that. My goal is to maintain our focus on Quality of Life, public safety, streamlined government, job creation, and local opportunities for higher education. I've kept my promises to you and will honor my commitments for our future.

**CONTINUED
ON
NEXT PAGE**

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

DOUGLAS V. GIBBS **AGE: 44**
OCCUPATION: Truck Driver, Columnist, U.S. Navy Veteran
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

Government's role should be limited to only the necessary functions to secure, and protect, our rights. The more government is involved in our lives, the less liberty we have. Therefore, as a long-time resident, and concerned citizen, of the fine City of Murrieta, I pledge to do all that I can to limit the ever increasing expansion of local government. In connection with that pledge, I support the Murrieta Initiatives on the November 2010 Ballot. These initiatives will institute term limits for elected officials, as well as limiting city salaries without extraneously limiting police, fire, and emergency personnel salaries. With these initiatives, and my election to the Murrieta City Council, I aim to give the government back to the people, and I will be a statesman (rather than a politician) that is truly representative, and responsive, to the citizens of Murrieta.

Douglas V. Gibbs
www.douglasvgibbs.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

KELLY A. BENNETT **AGE: 45**
OCCUPATION: Mayor/Councilwoman, Attorney-Mediator
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

As Murrieta's first Councilwoman, I have brought positive change to the City Council, opportunities to Murrieta, and helped restore our City's reputation. My attorney-mediator, negotiator and business experience greatly contributed to this change.

Despite the worst recession in 80 years, Murrieta now has more jobs, healthcare and educational opportunities. Murrieta was deemed the "second safest city in the nation" for 2009 by the FBI. We guarded City finances and reduced expenditures. We have increased infrastructure, providing swift access to the new Loma Linda University hospital. Clinton Keith and Ivy Street bridges, and the California Oaks/15 interchange expansion are in progress utilizing the \$32,000,000 we secured in federal funds.

My Council accomplishments include: Initiating negotiations for a four-year university; the "Fast-Track Planning" program; Murrieta Youth Court; Abandoned Property Ordinance; international trade; local hospital closure intervention; Mayor's Salute to Military Mothers; Heaven on Earth Food Drive; Produce for People Community Garden; Southwest Cities Coalition, and Chairwoman of Western Riverside Council of Governments.

Four years ago you elected me to serve. Four years later Murrieta is better off. To continue this improvement, re-elect Kelly Bennett.

Education: J.D. Pepperdine Law School 1990
B.A. Pepperdine University 1987

www.KellyABennett.com

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

ALAN LONG **AGE: 40**
OCCUPATION: Fire Captain / Paramedic
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

We are living in an era of unprecedented economic times that requires Financial Triage! Fiscal responsibility needs to be applied to all aspects of government. Taxpayers and Property Owners need to be protected. Government spending should not be placed on the backs of hard working citizens. Every budget line item needs to be scrutinized for efficiency and necessity. I will continue to support a fiscally conservative budget.

Protecting Murrieta's future has never been more important. Jobs, Open Space, Public Safety, and Quality Development add to our quality of life.

As a longtime resident of 35 years, I have seen the past. As a Planning Commissioner, Public Safety and Traffic Commissioner, Community Steering Committee member, Fire Captain/Paramedic, Counselor and Coach I have been part of the present and have impacted the future.

Today, my wife and I are raising a fourth generation of Longs in Murrieta. Our family ranges from first grade to Great Grandparents. Murrieta is our home, always has been and always will be!

My name is Alan Long; I'm a Husband, Father, Fire Captain, Commissioner, Counselor, Coach, and I want to be your next City Council member!

www.LongforCouncil.com

A fresh new face. A true public servant!

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBER,
CITY OF MURRIETA**

DAVID F. LANDRISCINA **AGE: 55**
OCCUPATION: OMT AT NRG
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

A resident of our City for 18 years, family man of 35 years leading by example and beyond reproach; a fiscal and social conservative, US Navy Veteran who works in the private sector and now the leading voice since 2001 who stood up for local control, and a survey based general plan update that included the public's desire for a diverse economic development plan to attract green technology businesses-asks for your vote to continue to build on these initiatives-because I believe we can do better.

I was there in support of the proponents who rode in on their horses to City Hall to demand we preserve rural and equestrian trails that included Bear Creek and resulted in the passage on June 16, 2009 of The Parks and Recreation 10 year Master Plan.

I am opposed to unfunded mandates and Measures C, D and E; because it puts our "Safest City" status in jeopardy-we need the expertise of the management team; however, I do support pension reforms for the newly hired.

It's the simple solutions that garner the big returns.

I respectfully ask for your vote.

www.murrietafirst.com

MEASURE "K" – COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ORDINANCE NO. 10-002

AN ORDINANCE OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION REQUESTING THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE TO CONDUCT A SPECIAL ELECTION ON NOVEMBER 2, 2010 FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE ELECTORS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY A MEASURE WHICH WOULD MODIFY THE COMMISSION'S AUTHORIZATION LIMIT TO ISSUE LIMITED TAX BONDS AND, IF APPROVED, WOULD AUTHORIZE SUCH INCREASE.

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2002, the voters of Riverside County approved Measure "A", authorizing the Riverside County Transportation Commission (Commission) to impose a retail transactions and use tax of one-half percent for a period of thirty (30) years to fund certain transportation improvements and programs serving Riverside County; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined that in order to expedite the construction of improvements and implementation of programs funded with the Measure "A" retail transactions and use tax, it is desirable to modify the maximum aggregate principal amount of limited tax bonds, which the Commission may have outstanding at any time; and

WHEREAS, state law requires that the maximum amount of limited tax bonds which the Commission have outstanding at any time be approved by a majority of the voters casting ballots on the issue;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION HEREBY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: Request for Election. The Commission requests the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to call an election seeking voter approval of a measure (the Measure), which would modify the bond limit as set forth in Section 2, below. The election shall be held on November 2, 2010, and may be consolidated with other elections to be held on that date. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 240303, the election shall be called and conducted in the same manner as provided by law for the conduct of elections by the county and the sample ballot shall comply with the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 240308(d). Approval of the Measure shall require a vote of a majority of the electors voting on the Measure at the election described in this section.

SECTION 2: Modification of Bond Limit. Upon the approval of a majority of the electors voting on the Measure at the November 2, 2010 election, the maximum aggregate principal amount of limited tax bonds which may be outstanding at any one time under Section VI of Ordinance 02-001 of the Riverside County Transportation Commission shall be increased to \$975 million.

SECTION 3: Approval by Commission; Effective Date. This Ordinance has been adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors of the Commission. If approved by the electors, the Ordinance shall take effect at the close of the polls on November 2, 2010.

SECTION 4: Status of Ordinance No. 02-001. Except as expressly amended herein, all other provisions of Ordinance No. 02-001 shall remain in full force and effect. This ordinance shall not affect the nature of the Measure "A" sales tax, the maximum tax rate, the purposes for which the revenue derived from the tax shall be used, the term of the tax, or the Expenditure Plan adopted as part of Measure "A."

SECTION 5: Further Acts. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to take all actions necessary and proper to implement this Ordinance, including, without limitation, the execution of related documents, agreements or other instruments or correcting technical errors in this Ordinance or related documents.

SECTION 6: Severability. If any provision(s) of this Ordinance is (are) for any reason held invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, that holding shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or Ordinance No. 02-001, and the Commission declares that it would have passed each and every part of this Ordinance irrespective of the validity of any other part.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 14th Day of July, 2010

Bob Buster, Chair
Riverside County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:

Jennifer Harmon
Clerk of the Board

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE “K”

In November 2002, the voters of Riverside County approved a 30-year renewal of the transportation sales tax known as Measure “A” to fund certain transportation improvements and programs in Riverside County. Measure “A,” as required by state law, includes a limit on the amount of bonded indebtedness that can be utilized to finance projects. The current limitation on bonded indebtedness backed by Measure “A” revenue, in the aggregate principal amount at any one time outstanding, is not to exceed \$500 million.

This measure, if adopted, would increase the current limitation on bonded indebtedness backed by Measure “A” revenue, in the aggregate principal amount at any one time outstanding, to \$975 million.

An increase in the amount of the bonded indebtedness will not impact the transportation sales tax imposed. An increase in the amount of the bonded indebtedness will allow construction of certain transportation projects to be expedited.

A majority of the electors voting on this measure must vote “yes” in order for the measure to pass. Passage of the measure will result in Ordinance 10-002 of the Riverside County Transportation Commission becoming effective at the close of polls on November 2, 2010.

By: Dana M. Smith,
Deputy County Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “K”

In this economy, nothing is more important than providing jobs – high-paying jobs located here in Riverside County. More importantly we need to create these jobs NOW!

Thanks to record low interest rates and lower bids on new construction, we can reshape Riverside County’s transportation system earlier so that we can better plan for traffic, improve public safety, and provide for a brighter economic future. Most importantly, Measure “K” does not raise, lengthen or effect current tax rates now — or in the future.

Proven Track Record

Measure “K” is based on previous Riverside County voter approval of Measure “A”, a half cent transportation sales tax program. By a two-thirds vote margin, Measure “A” guaranteed implementation of a number of voter-approved projects, they include:

- Widening the 91 Freeway in Riverside and Corona
- Widening I-215
- Improving freeway interchanges in the Coachella Valley, Riverside, Murrieta, Temecula, Moreno Valley and Mira Loma
- Expanding Metrolink service to Moreno Valley and Perris
- Improving major streets throughout the county

Invest in Jobs and Economic Recovery

The purpose of this measure is to allow the Riverside County Transportation Commission to sell an additional \$475 million in bonds to finance voter approved transportation projects. It’s a modest increase over the current level, limits indebtedness to less than 25 percent of the Measure “A” revenues and is based on strict fiscal safeguards.

No New Taxes!

Most importantly, this will be done without raising or modifying the existing Measure “A” tax rate in any way. Investing in additional projects NOW will:

- Create more than 25,000 construction jobs.
- Ensure lower project costs.
- Lower commute times
- Provide additional Metrolink service

Measure “K” will enable Riverside County to invest in voter-approved projects sooner to benefit taxpayers, and do so WITH NO INCREASE IN TAXES.

Vote YES on Measure “K” and help our County recover and succeed NOW!

By: Marion Ashley,
Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

Kay S. Cenicerros,
Retired Educator

Mary H. Curtin,
Former Secretary/Treasurer Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO

Richard R. Oliphant,
Founder and Board Member, Coachella Valley Economic Partnership

G. Richard Olds, M.D.,
Dean, University of California, Riverside, School of Medicine

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “K”

Wasteful spending by national, state, and local government is increasing the public debt, bringing calls for higher taxes, and costing people jobs.

The politicians pushing Measure “K” hope voters will ignore that and allow them to borrow nearly \$1 billion in the promise of job creation.

They claim Measure “K” approves a “modest increase” in the debt limit. Raising the debt limit 95% to borrow nearly \$1 billion is hardly modest. It is obscene.

The backers of Measure “K” promise that it will create more than 25,000 jobs. That is a highly questionable claim that sounds much like an empty promise we’ve all heard before from other politicians.

Last year, Congress passed a \$787 billion Economic Stimulus bill that dramatically increased the national debt promising it would create jobs. The President signed the bill promising it would put an end to rising unemployment.

That didn’t happen. Despite the increased deficit spending, unemployment still went up. In Riverside County our unemployment rate was 8.5% before the Stimulus. Today our unemployment rate has soared to 15.3%.

If these borrow and spend policies could not pull our nation out this economic slump, we should not expect them to help Riverside County’s economic recovery.

The Federal Debt is over \$13 trillion and growing. The State’s Debt is set to rise to over \$131 billion. Riverside County’s Debt is \$2.5 billion.

Help break this constant cycle of borrowing by our politicians and force government to live within its means.

Vote No on Measure “K”.

By: Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers For Accountable Government

Michael S. Geller,
Moreno Valley Taxpayers Association

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “K”

Riverside County is \$2.5 billion in debt. Last year, the County spent over \$89 million of taxpayer money to pay the interest on its long-term debt.

Voters should reject Measure “K” because it will allow politicians to increase the amount of debt that we taxpayers will be responsible for paying back with interest.

In a previous election voters were asked to tax themselves to help fund transportation projects. Voters approved this tax with the requirement that our government would limit the amount of debt for these projects to \$500 million.

After voters approved this tax, the politicians trusted with spending the money now claim they need to take on a much higher level of debt. They want to virtually double the amount of debt they can incur for these infrastructure projects and raise the debt limit to an astonishing \$975 million.

The principle and interests payments on such debt will easily be over \$1 billion.

During these tough economic times our scarce tax dollars are greatly needed for the vital services our communities require. Our money should not be spent making even larger interest payments to make already rich Wall Street bond sellers even richer.

When the average person maxes out a credit card and is only making the minimum monthly payment, the credit card company doesn't simply come in and double the cardholders credit limit. We should not be doing that for our local politicians.

Government must live within its means. Instead of allowing government to saddle us with more debt and greater interest payments, we need to stand up and put an end to these borrow and spend policies.

It's time to stop government from borrowing money it doesn't have and hold our local politicians accountable for their spending by voting NO on Measure “K”.

By: Michael S. Geller,
Moreno Valley Taxpayers Association

Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers For Accountable Government

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “K”

Improve Riverside County roads and create jobs WITHOUT new Taxes! Join Riverside County business and community leaders in voting YES on Measure “K”.

Tell our local officials to deliver needed transportation improvements TODAY.

Measure “K” will:

- **Improve our roads WITHOUT increasing taxes** for the General Fund of Riverside County or any other local government agency.
- Build on the success of the previously approved transportation improvement measure passed by two-thirds of County voters in 2002.
- **Deliver a VOTER APPROVED list of projects that widen our freeways, improve local streets, and support METROLINK service.**

Measure “K” allows the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), an agency of your local elected representatives, to finance transportation improvement projects when we need them....TODAY! This means voter approved projects will be built years ahead of schedule, saving costs, while creating thousands of good paying local construction jobs NOW!

TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS ARE REQUIRED. Measure “K” continues important taxpayer protections put in place by voters in 2002 requiring funding to be spent on VOTER APPROVED improvements to highways and local streets.

Measure “K” simply allows RCTC, with a proven track record for strict accountability, local control, and an unblemished credit rating, to invest in our County's future. Most importantly, it does this with NO INCREASE IN TAXES.

Please join us and vote for Improved Roads and More Jobs. **Vote YES on Measure “K”.**

By: MARION ASHLEY,
Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

KAY S. CENICEROS,
Retired Educator

MARY H. CURTIN,
Former Secretary/Treasurer,
Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO

RICHARD R. OLIPHANT,
Founder and Board Member,
Coachella Valley Economic Partnership

G. RICHARD OLDS M.D.,
Dean, University of California Riverside, School of Medicine

MEASURE “L” – COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

The People of the County of Riverside ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This ordinance shall be known and may be cited as the *Public Safety and Taxpayer Protection Act of 2010*.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS.

- (a) Given current budgetary constraints, the People of Riverside County find that it is necessary and appropriate to protect taxpayers by prohibiting any increases in the current formula for retirement and death benefits provided to public safety employees without a vote of the electorate.
- (b) It is also the desire of the People of Riverside County to protect its public safety employees by ensuring that the widows and orphans of the County's firefighters, sheriff and other public safety employees are provided for if they are killed in the line of duty.
- (c) The People of Riverside County further determine that it will promote budgetary stability to prohibit changes in the formula for retirement and death benefits of public safety officers without a vote of the electorate, so as to allow the County to accurately forecast its future retirement expenditures.
- (d) The People of Riverside County further recognize that reducing the retirement benefits for current employees would be an unlawful impairment of contract in violation of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution, as well as Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution of the State of California
- (e) The People of Riverside County find that fulfilling these goals – of freezing retirement benefits for public safety employees while ensuring that the families of public safety employees killed in the line of duty are provided for – will help the County continue to attract and retain skilled and experienced public safety employees by providing them and their families with predictability in their retirement and death benefits.

SECTION 3. Chapter 3.10 is added to the Riverside County Code to read:

CHAPTER 3.10 RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES

Section 3.10.010 Definitions.

For purposes of this Chapter, the following definitions apply:

- (a) “Retirement Benefits” means those retirement benefits offered to public safety employees and their survivors as of the effective date of this measure, and includes Service Retirement, Disability Retirement, Industrial Disability Retirement, Survivor Continuance, and Retiree Health Benefit.
- (b) “Death Benefit” means those pre-retirement death benefits offered to beneficiaries of public safety employees as of the effective date of this measure.
- (c) “Retirement Benefit Formula” means the retirement benefit formula currently in place for public safety employees, which is known as “3% @ 50”, and includes the current limitation on these benefits of 90% of final compensation.
- (d) “Retirement System” means the California Public Employee Retirement System (“CalPERS”) or any successor retirement system
- (e) “Public Safety Employees” means those employees who are defined as safety employees under CalPERS as of the effective date of this measure, including but not limited to firefighters and peace officers.

Section 3.10.020 Limitations on Changes To Retirement and Death Benefits.

The Board of Supervisors shall not take any action, by ordinance, resolution, or otherwise, which increases or decreases the retirement benefit formula of, or increases or decreases pre-retirement death benefits to the beneficiaries of, any past, current, or future public safety employee of Riverside County in the retirement system, without first obtaining the approval of a majority of those qualified electors voting on the matter. This section shall not apply to cost of living adjustments, salary increases, and annual leave or compensatory time cash outs.

Section 3.10.030 Effect Of Changes In Retirement System

This ordinance shall apply with equal force to any Retirement System in place now or in the future. If CalPERS ceases to offer the 3% @ 50 Benefit Formula, or if Riverside County ceases to contract with CalPERS for retirement and death benefits, the County shall nonetheless continue to offer the same retirement benefit formula and pre-retirement death benefits to public safety employees. If the same retirement benefit formula or the same pre-retirement death benefits are not available under the retirement system then in force, the County shall provide retirement and death benefits that are substantially similar.

SECTION 4. AMENDMENTS.

This ordinance shall not be modified, amended or repealed, except by a majority vote of those qualified electors in Riverside County voting on the matter.

SECTION 5. CONFLICTS AND COMPETING MEASURES.

- (a) In the event this ordinance conflicts with the terms of any other ordinance, resolution, or policy of the County, this ordinance shall control.
- (b) In the event that another measure ("competing measure") appears on the same ballot as this ordinance which seeks to adopt or impose provisions that differ in any regard to, or supplement, the provisions or requirements contained in this ordinance, the voters hereby expressly declare their intent that if both the competing measure and this ordinance receive a majority of votes cast, and if this ordinance receives a greater number of votes than the competing measure, this ordinance shall prevail in its entirety over the competing measure without regard to whether specific provisions of each measure directly conflict with each other.
- (c) In the event that the competing measure and this ordinance receive a majority of votes cast, and the competing measure receives a greater number of votes than this ordinance, this ordinance shall be deemed complementary to the competing measure. To this end, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, the provisions of this ordinance shall be fully adopted except to the extent that specific provisions contained in each measure are deemed to be in direct conflict with each other on a "provision by provision" basis pursuant to *Yoshisato v. Superior Court* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 978.

SECTION 6. SEVERABILITY.

If any section, subsection, subdivision, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this ordinance is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The People of Riverside County hereby declare that they would have adopted the ordinance and each section, subsection, subdivision, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions thereof be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SECTION 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this ordinance shall be considered as adopted upon the date that the vote is declared by the Board of Supervisors and shall go into effect 10 days after that date, as provided for in Section 9122 of the California Elections Code.

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "L"

This measure, if adopted, would prohibit the Riverside County Board of Supervisors from taking any action to increase or decrease the current retirement benefit formula or increase or decrease the current death benefits to any past, current or future public safety employee or past, current or future beneficiary, without first obtaining a majority vote of qualified electors who vote on the matter.

Voter approval would not be required for cost of living adjustments, salary increases, and annual leave or compensatory time cash-outs.

The ordinance would also require the County of Riverside to continue to offer the same CalPERS 3% @ 50 Benefit Formula, or substantially similar benefit, for retirement of public safety employees, as defined by CalPERS, even if CalPERS cease to offer the 3% at 50 and even if the County of Riverside were to no longer contract with CalPERS. It would also require the County of Riverside to continue to offer the same, or substantially similar, pre-retirement death benefits to public safety employees.

"Public Safety Employees" are those defined by CalPERS as all local police officer, local sheriffs, firefighters, safety officers, county peace officers, and school safety members, employed by a contracting agency who have by contract been included within the system.

"Retirement Benefits" are defined as service retirement, disability retirement, industrial disability retirement, survivor continuance, and retiree health benefits of public safety employees and their survivors. "Death Benefits" are defined to include pre-retirement death benefits offered to beneficiaries of public safety employees.

A majority of the electors voting on this measure must vote "yes" in order for the measure to pass. In the event of a competing measure, this measure will prevail over the competing measure in the event both measures receive a majority of votes cast but this measure receives a greater number of votes than the competing measure. Passage of this measure will result in the ordinance becoming effective 10 days after the vote is declared by the Board of Supervisors.

By: Dana M. Smith, Deputy County Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “L”

Voters should vote Yes on Measure “L” because it will make it illegal for Riverside County officials to increase or decrease the pension benefits paid to its public safety employees without a vote of the people.

Measure “L” will also make it illegal for Riverside County’s politicians to increase or decrease the death benefits paid to the spouses and children of Deputy Sheriffs killed in the line of duty without a vote of the people.

Measure “L” simply gives the voters more power over the spending decisions of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

Like Proposition 13 protects taxpayers by requiring a vote of the people to approve local bond debts, Measure “L” will require a vote of the people should Riverside County negotiate higher pensions with the unions for public safety employees.

In the past, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors gave larger pensions to the unions that represent Riverside County’s public safety employees without a vote of the people.

If Measure “L” is passed, the voters will be able to approve or reject any pension increases County Supervisors agree to in closed door meetings with these unions.

Today, County politicians can raid the public safety pension fund or cut the safety net provided to the widows and orphans of Deputy Sheriffs killed in the line of duty without a vote of the people.

If Measure “L” is passed, the voters will have the power to approve or reject any attempts by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to raid the public safety pension fund or to cut the Death Benefits paid to the families of fallen officers.

Hold politicians accountable for their spending and protect the families of the Deputy Sheriffs who put their lives at risk to protect our families.

Vote Yes on Measure “L”.

By: Ruben Rasso,
Deputy Sheriff, Ret.

Darren Hoopingarner,
Riverside County Firefighter

Joe Lucsko,
Supervising Probation Officer, Ret.

Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers For Accountable Government

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “L”

DON'T LOCK-IN GOLD-PLATED PUBLIC UNION PENSIONS

Who wrote Measure “L”? The public employee union that wants to permanently lock-in skyrocketing, gold-plated pensions, even as unemployment tops 15% in Riverside County and thousands of our neighbors lose their homes to foreclosure.

The union knows Measure “L” makes it virtually impossible to even reduce lavish, taxpayer-funded pensions without a costly election.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY THE UNION'S MISLEADING ARGUMENTS

Measure “L” promoters claim it ensures that politicians can’t “raid the public safety pension fund.” The truth is state law prohibits anyone, including politicians, from raiding the pension fund. And no one can “cut the death benefits” promised to deputy sheriffs killed in the line of duty.

This union’s extravagant pension program is actually draining the County’s General Fund, which pays for vital services like sheriff’s deputies and fire protection. These services will be cut if taxpayers are forced to keep paying for fat public union pensions.

Don’t be fooled by the union-hired political operatives who signed the argument in favor of Measure “L”.

It’s you – the taxpayer – who will be left holding the bag for these unaffordable pensions.

STOP PUBLIC EMPLOYEE UNION PENSION ABUSE

PROTECT TAXPAYERS

VOTE NO ON MEASURE “L”

By: Jon Coupal,
President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Robert E. Bowers,
Riverside County Pension Reform Committee Member

Patricia “Corky” Larson,
Former Executive Director Coachella Valley Association of Governments
Former County Supervisor (1982-1994)

Cindy Roth,
President Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce

Victor Miceli,
Retired Riverside County Superior Court Judge

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “L”

MEASURE “L” LOCKS-IN GOLD-PLATED PENSION BENEFITS VOTE “NO” ON MEASURE “L” TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS

Measure “L” was written and paid for by a public employee union seeking to permanently lock-in gold-plated pension benefits for its members – already the most generous and expensive in the six Southern California counties.

Don’t be fooled by the deceptive language in Measure “L”.

Measure “L” makes it nearly impossible for Riverside County to ever reform pension benefits that by 2016 will consume one-third of the County’s entire public safety personnel budget. Much-needed reform could save taxpayers \$80 million over the next decade.

Don’t be fooled by deceptive claims from the public employee union bankrolling Measure “L”.

The Deputy Sheriffs’ union is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to pass Measure “L” because it wants to block pension reform.

The union’s claims about widows and children of fallen peace officers are designed to produce well-earned sympathy, but that’s not what Measure “L” is really about.

Neither the Board of Supervisors nor the public would ever consider arbitrarily reducing such benefits.

The real intent of Measure “L” is to create a process so expensive and complicated there can never be meaningful pension reform for members of this union.

It costs taxpayers up to \$2 million to pay the retirement benefits for just one of these union workers, who can retire at age 50 and receive up to 90% of their highest salary for life. This debt contributes to \$6 billion in county employee pension liabilities.

Unless we do something to reform this system, taxpayers will eventually have to choose between severe reductions in essential county services or significant tax increases.

VOTE “NO” ON MEASURE “L” TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS

By: Jon Coupal,
President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Robert E. Bowers,
Riverside County Pension Reform Committee Member

Cindy Roth,
President Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce

Patricia “Corky” Larson,
Former Executive Director Coachella Valley Association of Governments

John G. Gabbert,
Riverside County Superior Court Judge (ret.)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “L”

Those against Measure “L” left out several facts that undermine their argument.

FACT: Riverside County’s Public Safety Pension Plan is financially strong with \$1.4 billion in assets.

FACT: Measure “L” takes power away from politicians and gives the people the right to vote on how much is paid in public safety pensions. It does not permanently lock these pensions in at today’s level.

FACT: Measure “L” could save taxpayers millions of dollars by preventing the Board of Supervisors from giving bigger pensions to public safety employee unions by requiring voter approval of any increases.

FACT: The average retired Riverside County peace officer is 60 years old and receives a pension of \$34,385 annually. They do not receive Social Security benefits for their time serving Riverside County.

FACT: Nearly 60,000 residents signed petitions to put Measure “L” on the ballot.

FACT: Jon Coupal, the Sacramento-based activist fighting Measure “L”, pushed a proposition in 2005 that would have eliminated the current Death Benefits paid to the widows and orphans of all California Firefighters and Police Officers killed in the line of duty.

FACT: The wives and children of Riverside County’s law enforcement officers have no control over the conditions their husbands and fathers face protecting our neighborhoods and families from crime and violence.

Politicians should not be allowed to cut or eliminate the Death Benefits paid to the widows and orphans of officers killed in the line of duty.

You can protect Deputy Sheriff’s families and your tax dollars by voting Yes on Measure “L”.

By: Ruben Rasso,
Deputy Sheriff, Ret.

Joe Lucsko,
Supervising Probation Officer, Ret.

Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers For Accountable Government

MEASURE "M" - COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 899

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE PROHIBITING
INCREASES IN AND ALLOWING DECREASES IN PUBLIC
SAFETY PENSIONS WITHOUT VOTER APPROVAL**

The people of the County of Riverside ordains as follows:

Section 1. **TITLE.** This ordinance shall be known as the Taxpayer Protection and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2010.

Section 2. **FINDINGS.**

- a. Given current budgetary constraints, taxpayers should be protected against increases in retirement and death benefits provided to public safety employees without voter approval.
- b. Widows and orphans of public safety employees whose death has been determined to be job related, however, shall be protected and benefits paid to such beneficiaries upon the death of the public safety employee shall not be reduced without voter approval.
- c. Given the County's fiscal crisis, retirement benefits for future public safety employees may need to be reduced. It is the intent that the Board of Supervisors continue to retain the discretion to reduce retirement benefits to the extent permitted by law.
- d. Existing public safety employees have a right to receive certain retirement benefits that were promised them upon employment. This ordinance does not allow the reduction of retirement benefits or death benefits which would constitute an unlawful impairment of contract in violation of Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution or Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution of the State of California.

Section 3. **PURPOSE.** The purpose of this ordinance is to prohibit increases in public safety employee retirement and death benefits without voter approval and to clarify that the Board of Supervisors retains the discretion to decrease public safety employee retirement and death benefits, to the extent permitted by law, without voter approval.

Section 4. **DEFINITIONS.**

- a. Death Benefits. Pre-retirement death benefits offered to public safety employees and their survivors as of the effective date of this measure.
- b. Public Safety Employees. Employees who are defined as safety employees under the California Public Employee Retirement System ("CalPERS") or any successor retirement system.
- c. Retirement Benefits. Retirement benefits offered to public safety employees and their survivors as of the effective date of this measure, and includes service retirement, disability retirement, industrial disability retirement, survivor continuance, and retiree health benefit.
- d. Retirement Benefit Formula. The retirement benefit formula currently in place for public safety employees, which is known as "3% @ 50," and includes the current limitation on these benefits of 90% of final compensation.
- e. Retirement System. The CalPERS or any successor retirement system.

Section 5. **LIMITATIONS ON CHANGES TO RETIREMENT AND DEATH BENEFITS.**

- a. The Board of Supervisors shall not take any action, by ordinance, resolution, or otherwise, which increases the retirement benefit formula of, or increases death benefits to the beneficiaries of, any past, current or future public safety employee of Riverside County in the retirement system, without first obtaining the approval of a majority of those qualified electors voting on the matter. This subdivision shall not apply to cost of living adjustments, salary increases and annual leave or compensatory time cash outs.

- b. The Board of Supervisors hereby retains the discretion to decrease the retirement benefit formula of, or decrease death benefits to the beneficiaries of, any past, current or future public safety employee of Riverside County in the retirement system without first obtaining the approval of a majority of those qualified electors voting on the matter. This subdivision shall not apply to pre-retirement benefits paid to the beneficiaries of a public safety employee whose death has been determined to be job-related. A reduction of such benefits for those beneficiaries of public safety employees whose death has been determined to be job-related shall not be made without first obtaining the approval of a majority of those qualified electors voting on the matter.
- c. Before submitting any increase in the retirement benefit formula or death benefits to a vote of the electorate, or decreasing the retirement formula or death benefits, the County shall meet and confer with public safety employee representative groups if required by the Myers Milias Brown Act (Government Code section 3505 et seq.).
- d. No reduction in retirement benefits or death benefits shall be taken which would constitute an unlawful impairment of contract in violation of Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution, as well as Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution of the State of California. If CalPERS ceases to offer the 3% at 50 benefit formula or if Riverside County ceases to contract with CalPERS for retirement and death benefits, the County shall not be required to offer the same retirement benefit formula and pre-retirement death benefits to public safety employees unless the failure to do so would constitute an unlawful impairment of contract under the federal or state constitutions or violate federal or state law.

Section 6. AMENDMENTS. This ordinance shall not be modified, amended or repealed, except by a majority vote of those qualified electors voting on the measure.

Section 7. CONFLICTS AND COMPETING MEASURES.

- a. In the event this ordinance conflicts with the terms of any other ordinance, resolution or policy of the County, this ordinance shall control.
- b. In the event that another measure ("competing measure") appears on the same ballot as this ordinance which seeks to adopt or impose provisions that differ in any regard to, or supplement, the provisions or requirements contained in this ordinance, the voters hereby expressly declare their intent that if both the competing measure and this ordinance receive a majority of votes cast, and if this ordinance receives a greater number of votes than the competing measure, this ordinance shall prevail in its entirety over the competing measure without regard to whether specific provisions of each measure directly conflict with each other.

Section 8. SEVERABILITY. If any provision or portion of this ordinance is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the ordinance. It is hereby declared that the ordinance and each and every provision and portion thereof would have been adopted irrespective of the fact that any one or more provisions or portions thereof be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

Section 9. EFFECTIVE DATE. Pursuant to section 9122 of the Elections Code, this ordinance shall take effect ten days after the vote is declared by the Board of Supervisors.

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "M"

This measure, if adopted, would prohibit the Riverside County Board of Supervisors from taking any action which would increase the retirement benefit formula or death benefit of any past, current or future public safety employee or their beneficiaries without first obtaining a majority vote of qualified electors who vote on the matter.

Decreases in the retirement benefit formula of, or death benefits of, any past, current or future public safety employee or their beneficiaries would not require voter approval. However, voter approval would be required for any reduction in benefits paid to beneficiaries as a result of a job-related death of a public safety employee.

Voter approval would not be required for cost of living adjustments, salary increases and annual leave or compensatory time cash outs.

The County of Riverside, if CalPERS ceases to offer the 3% at 50 benefit formula or if the County of Riverside ceases to contract with CalPERS for retirement and death benefits, would not be required to offer the same retirement benefit formula and pre-retirement death benefits to public safety employees unless failure to do so would violate federal or state law or constitute an unlawful impairment of contract under the federal or state constitution.

If required by the Myers Milias Brown Act, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors would meet and confer with public safety employee representative groups before submitting any proposed increase in benefits to the voters or before instituting any decrease in benefits.

"Public Safety Employees" are those defined by CalPERS as all local police officer, local sheriffs, firefighters, safety officers, county peace officers, and school safety members, employed by a contracting agency who have by contract been included within the system.

"Retirement Benefits" are defined as service retirement, disability retirement, industrial disability retirement, survivor continuance, and retiree health benefits of public safety employees and their survivors. "Death Benefits" are defined to include pre-retirement death benefits offered to beneficiaries of public safety employees.

A majority of the electors voting on this measure must vote "yes" in order for the measure to pass. In the event of a competing measure this measure will prevail over the competing measure in the event both measures receive a majority of votes cast but this measure receives a greater number of votes than the competing measure. Passage of this measure will result in Riverside County Ordinance 899 becoming effective 10 days after the vote is declared by the Board of Supervisors.

By: Dana M. Smith
Deputy County Counsel

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "M"

PUT AN END TO PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PENSION ABUSE.
VOTE YES ON MEASURE "M".

Gold-plated pensions for public employees have pushed many local governments in California to the brink of bankruptcy.

Riverside County taxpayers have been left holding the bag for over \$6 billion in employee pension liabilities.

A Riverside County Deputy Sheriff can retire at age 50 and receive up to 90 percent of his or her highest salary for life, along with generous health care benefits. The cost to taxpayers for each deputy's retirement benefits can be up to \$2 million.

Many former public safety employees are among the 87 county retirees receiving pensions ranging from \$100,000 to \$195,000 annually.

By 2016, retirement benefits will consume one of every three dollars of the county's entire public safety personnel budget. That means losing tens of millions of dollars needed to put deputies on the street to protect you and your family.

Those who put their lives on the line to protect us deserve fair retirement benefits, but those benefits must also be affordable for taxpayers.

Measure "M" requires voter approval to increase pension benefits, but it also enables the Board of Supervisors to negotiate with the union to reduce benefits in the future.

In Orange County, the Board of Supervisors persuaded public employee unions to support a new pension system modeled on less-costly private-sector retirement plans. It not only saved taxpayers money, it was less costly for employees.

Measure "M" ensures the Riverside County Board of Supervisors can negotiate similar cost-saving reforms to protect taxpayers while preserving fair benefits for public employees.

That's why the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers' Association and all five members of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors strongly urge you to vote YES on Measure "M" to reform pensions and give voters control.

By: Jon Coupal,
President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Robert E. Bowers,
Riverside County Pension Reform Committee

Cindy Roth,
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce President

Patricia "Corky" Larson,
Former Executive Director, Coachella Valley Association of Governments

John G. Gabbert,
Riverside County Superior Court Judge (ret.)

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "M"

Measure "M" is hypocritical and full of loopholes that could prove costly to taxpayers.

It was placed on the ballot by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and will not affect the excessive pensions of these politicians, their staffs, or the County's top administrators.

Measure "M" only targets the pensions of Riverside County's law enforcement officers who go to work each day risking their lives to keep our communities safe from crime and violence.

The pensions of retired rank and file Deputy Sheriffs are not "Gold-Plated." The average retired Deputy Sheriff earns a \$34,385 annual pension.

These Deputies all contributed money to their pensions. They don't receive Social Security benefits for their time serving Riverside County. Most pay a substantial amount of money for health insurance out of their own pockets.

But the generous pensions that will be paid to County Supervisors and exempt from Measure "M" can easily be described as "Gold-Plated."

The Press-Enterprise recently exposed that most Riverside County Supervisors will receive bigger pensions when they leave office than the average Firefighter or Deputy Sheriff will make in retirement.

If County Supervisor Bob Buster leaves office at the end of his term, he will receive an annual pension of over \$139,000.

County Supervisor John Benoit already makes over \$100,000 annually as a retired State Employee on top of his \$143,031 salary.

Don't allow politicians to target peace officers while exempting their pension increases from voter approval.

Reject the hypocrisy and these City of Bell type politics. Vote No on Measure "M."

By: Ruben Rasso,
Deputy Sheriff, Ret.

Joe Lucsko,
Supervising Probation Officer, Ret.

Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers For Accountable Government

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “M”

Measure “M” will not protect your tax dollars or control government spending.

It was placed on the ballot by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to preserve their political power so they can cut the reasonable benefits of Riverside County’s law enforcement officers without a vote of the people.

Measure “M” does nothing to control the pay, perks, or pensions of Riverside County’s Supervisors or top administrators.

- Measure “M” does not give voters the power to reject salary increases paid to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

Since 1997, total compensation for a County Supervisor increased over 130%. County Supervisor Bob Buster’s compensation climbed from \$69,463 to \$160,366 in just ten years.

- Measure “M” does not give voters the power to prevent County Supervisors from driving luxury cars at taxpayer expense.

The Press-Enterprise reported last year that County Supervisors were driving expensive vehicles that cost more than \$50,000 each at taxpayer expense.

- Measure “M” does not give voters the power to stop Riverside County’s politicians and administrators from receiving pensions larger than those earned by the firefighters and police officers who risk their lives protecting our communities.

The average pension paid to a retired Riverside County public safety employee is less than \$35,000 annually. But the majority of the Board of Supervisors will make over \$100,000 as an annual pension. Supervisor John Benoit will get a significant bump in his retirement since he already gets almost \$100,000 each year from the pension he’s paid as a retired State employee.

Voters should reject this flawed initiative that does nothing to limit the pay, perks, and pensions of Riverside County’s politicians and top administrators.

Stop City of Bell type of politics. Vote No on Measure “M”.

By: Ruben Rasso,
Deputy Sheriff, Ret.

Joe Lucsko,
Supervising Probation Officer, Ret.

Brian Floyd,
Riverside County Taxpayers for Accountable Government

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “M”

MEASURE “M” STOPS PUBLIC UNION PENSION ABUSE

Measure “M” puts the taxpayers and voters in charge of county pensions, not public employee unions and special interests. The reforms in Measure “M” can save taxpayers \$80 million over the next 10 years.

Measure “M” protects hardworking Riverside County taxpayers from a public employee union that opposes badly needed pension reforms. This union refuses to change its pension plan. The pension liability to public safety employees is projected to be \$1.82 billion by June 2010. The County’s unfunded public safety pension liability is \$194 million.

Today, 15% of Riverside County residents are out of work. Home foreclosures are rampant. Annual County tax revenues have plummeted by \$192 million.

But members of the union opposing Measure “M” continue to fight pension reform. Maybe it is because union members can retire at age 50 with up to 90% of their highest salary - up to \$107,518 annually, as well as partial monthly health care benefits. These lavish benefits put taxpayers on the hook for up to \$2 million for a single union retiree.

No wonder the union wants to change the subject! They’re hiding this outrageous taxpayer rip-off behind a smokescreen of false claims and misleading rhetoric.

The truth is Measure “M’s” reforms apply equally to all public safety personnel.

It’s time to rein in runaway public employee pension benefits that Riverside County taxpayers cannot afford.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE “M” FOR REAL PENSION REFORM

By: Jon Coupal,
President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Robert E. Bowers,
Riverside County Pension Reform Committee Member

Patricia “Corky” Larson,
Former Coachella Valley Association of Governments Executive Director
Retired County Supervisor (1982 - 1994)

Cindy Roth,
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce President

Victor Miceli,
Retired Riverside County Superior Court Judge

MEASURE “C” – CITY OF MURRIETA

Term Limits

Proposed Initiative: City Council Term Limitation

Revise the Murrieta City Code 1.20.020 as follows:

1.20.020 Terms of elected municipal officers.

~~A. Those elected municipal officers of the city whose terms of office would have prior to the adoption of this chapter, expired following the November 2005 general municipal election shall, instead, continue in their offices until the day of the November 2006 general municipal election of the city, and until their successors are elected and qualified.~~

A. B: Those elected municipal officers of the city whose terms of office would have, prior to the adoption of this chapter, expired following the November 2007 general election shall, instead, continue in their offices until the day of the November 2008 general municipal election of the city, and until their successors are elected and qualified. (Ord. 295 § 2, 2004; Ord. 116 § 1 (part), 1994; Ord. 7 § 3, 1991)

B. In order to broaden the opportunities for public service and to assure that elected officials of government are responsive to the citizens of the government, no elected official of the City of Murrieta or any other political subdivision of the City of Murrieta shall serve more than two consecutive terms in office.

C. For purposes of this Section, terms are considered consecutive if they are at least four years apart. A term shall be defined as four (4) years.

Reasons:

The term limitations that exist for other government offices are an example of the term limitations that should exist for local city government. City Council members volunteer their time at the behest of the people of Murrieta as citizen representatives. Since they volunteer their time except for a stipend, they should limit their terms in order to broaden the opportunities for others to participate in public service and to assure that elected officials of the government are responsive to the citizens of Murrieta.

Proponents:

Robert (Bob) S. Kowell

Casey A. Evans

Rick E. Reiss

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE “C”

Currently, the Murrieta Municipal Code does not limit the number of terms in office an elected official may serve. As such, under existing law, a City Council member may serve as many terms in office as he or she is elected to. California Government Code section 36502(b), however, authorizes city councils and the voters to impose limits on the number of terms a city council member may serve. Section 36502(b) states that:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the city council of a general law or charter city may adopt or the residents of the city may propose, by initiative, a proposal to limit or repeal a limit on the number of terms a member of the city council may serve on the city council, or the number of terms an elected mayor may serve.

Measure “C” seeks to limit City Council members to serving no more than two consecutive terms. Pursuant to the text of Measure “C”, “terms are considered consecutive if they are at least four years apart.” A legal question exists as to whether “consecutive” is adequately defined to permit enforcement.

It is unclear from the terms of Measure “C” when it applies. It does not provide whether the measure applies retroactively or prospectively only. California Government Code section 36502(b) provides that a term limit measure, if approved, applies prospectively only. The pertinent language of section 36502(b) is as follows:

Any proposal to limit the number of terms a member of the city council may serve on the city council, or the number of terms an elected mayor may serve, shall apply prospectively only and shall not become operative unless it is submitted to the electors of the city at a regularly scheduled election and a majority of the votes cast on the question favor the adoption of the proposal.

In other words, section 36502(b) requires that any term limits provision may only apply to terms served after the effective date of the measure. Measure “C”, however, provides only that:

In order to broaden the opportunities for public service and to assure elected officials of government are responsive to citizens of the government, no elected official of the City of Murrieta or any other political subdivision of the City of Murrieta shall serve more than two consecutive terms in office.

Thus, a legal question exists as to whether portions of Measure “C” conflict with state laws.

/s/ Leslie E. Devaney, City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “C”

If politicians were statesmen, they would self-impose term limits. Statesmen believe they are there to serve the people, and that after a term or two, it is their obligation to return to the private sector, or move on to a different kind of political office.

In Murrieta, a city councilperson's term of office is four years. However, without term limits, it is possible for a member to remain in office indefinitely. As a result, the same old cast of councilpersons rotate around as mayor and back to councilperson and therefore, nothing ever really changes.

The term limits proposed by this measure limits a councilmember to no more than two consecutive terms. After two terms, they would be required to take a term off. This initiative does not disallow them from running for office again after taking a term off. However, the councilperson will not have the incumbency to rely on to get elected in a future election.

Term limits allow the City Council to occasionally be refreshed with new faces, permitting the city to be represented by new people with fresh ideas. By voting for this initiative, we are sending a message that we do not wish for career politicians to run the city. However, this initiative does not keep good people out of office permanently. Term limits do encourage our representatives to serve the city as volunteers and honest representatives, rather than lifelong politicians.

Both Menifee and Murrieta are proposing term limits, and if successful, this initiative will spread to the surrounding cities. These proposed term limits are even more generous than term limits by the State government. Those are permanent. These are temporary.

This Murrieta Measure “C” is endorsed by the National Tax Limitation Committee and other groups that want to limit the size of government.

By: Robert S. Kowell, Proponent

Casey A. Evans, Proponent

Richard D. Ackerman, Attorney at Law

Rick Reiss, Proponent

Douglas V. Gibbs, Murrieta City Council Candidate

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “C”

Why did the Proponents spend over \$20,000 on these Measures?

Why did they hire professionals to gather signatures rather than use local supporters?

Why are signatures of Temecula residents on these Murrieta Measures?

Their motives?

Proponents state their “revolution began two years ago.” Their agenda is to overthrow our system of city government beginning with your right to choose. They want to limit your choice to select candidates in an effort to get their puppets elected, an effort that has failed for 4 of their candidates in the last 2 elections. Why? The candidates then, and now, were not qualified to serve, and you, the voters, didn't elect any of them.

Measure “C” takes away your right to choose whom to keep in office or whom to vote out. Do you want to re-elect candidates with the expertise and experience to achieve the community's vision for Murrieta? Measure “C” denies you that right. Their backdoor approach will also deny us the stability to remain a vibrant, family-oriented community - one of the safest cities in the United States.

Their criteria is only whether or not a candidate will push **their** measures. No noble idea of service to the community or improving city government! No qualifications except to be know-nothing, candidate-puppets to follow blindly and support their party line!

Don't let this small group of political opportunists strip you of your constitutional right to vote for the candidate of your choice. Their revolution stops here. Vote NO on Measure “C”.

By: Larry R. Dean, Murrieta P.D. Chief (Ret.)

Ruthanne Taylor Berger, Murrieta Resident

Paul Diffley, School Board Member

Barbara J. Nugent, Coordinator Community Cares

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “C”

Term limits already exist in Murrieta. Every time you vote, you decide whether an office holder is termed out or remains. Having seen term limits imposed at the state level, you easily understand the absolute mess term limits created in the Legislature; there is no one with long-term experience to engineer compromise and progress from either side. What's more, this initiative steals your liberty. It implies that Murrieta voters aren't bright enough, or concerned enough, to choose between removing a bad candidate or keeping a good candidate. Keep your liberty, your constitutionally-guaranteed freedom to choose.

In the four City Council elections between 2003 and 2008, 33 candidates ran for office and in that time frame, all 5 council members were replaced. This means that the process works in Murrieta: the residents voted for the candidates they wanted to represent them. How's that for term limits?

Murrieta residents were savvy enough to reject candidates in the last three elections that were backed by the authors of this ill-conceived term-limit initiative. Show them that "savvyness" still exists and use your NO vote on this Measure.

Among community leaders against this Measure is former Murrieta Fire Chief, Paul Christman. Join Chief Christman and the undersigned: Vote NO on Measure “C” and keep Murrieta's vibrant and effective democracy alive.

By: Paul F. Diffley, School Board Member

Larry R. Dean, Murrieta Police Chief (Retired)

Barbara J. Nugent, Coordinator, Community Cares

Ruthanne Taylor Berger, Murrieta Resident

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “C”

This term limit measure is endorsed by the National Tax Limitation Committee.

Because of abuse due to lack of oversight, term limits has been implemented at most government levels and in many cities. Our Founding Fathers didn't have term limits because they didn't abuse their time in office. Today's leadership is tied to special interests.

The mess in Sacramento, and DC as well, stated by the opposition, has nothing to do with term limits; it has to do with political division.

Ask yourselves why anyone would want to serve as a volunteer councilperson for more than 8 years and spend a lot of money to stay on the City Council. It's all about special interests.

Eight years is enough and if a councilperson is passionate about serving people, this term limitation allows them to run again after a time out. This is not taking away your right to vote, it is empowering our vote.

The impartial analysis done by the city attorney is not an impartial analysis. She claims not to know what the word “consecutive” means. Why is this? Most of us understand the word perfectly well.

The opposition is wrong in saying that the electorate voted against candidates that ran on these initiatives in the last 3 elections. There has only been one election since these initiatives qualified in 2008.

The opposition is right in saying that all five members of the city council, since 2003, were removed. Two of them were convicted of corruption.

By: Richard D. Ackerman, Past President (2008-2010)
Mt. San Jacinto College Foundation

Robert S. Kowell, Chairman, Limited Government PAC

Patrice C. Lynes, Temecula City Council Candidate

Douglas V. Gibbs, Murrieta City Council Candidate

Emilia Rychener, Murrieta City Council Candidate

MEASURE “D” – CITY OF MURRIETA

Limits on City Council Compensation

Proposed Initiative: Limits on City Council Compensation

Ballot Title: Limits on City Council Compensation

The ordinance proposed by initiative petition would limit the City Council members stipend to 15% of the median family/household income of the people of Murrieta. This ordinance would limit them from receiving any other personal benefits including, but not limited to club memberships, medical and life insurance, and pensions. The proposed ordinance would require that any increase in City Council benefits be by a vote of a super-majority of the registered voters of Murrieta, or fifty-five percent (55%).

The proposed cap on City Council benefits would be exclusive of any amounts payable to each City Council member as reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their official duties for the City, as provided by section 36514.5 of the Government Code. The proposed ordinance would require that such reimbursement be established by a policy resolution adopted by the City Council.

Reasons:

The City Council monthly stipend based on 15% of the median family/household for the City of Murrieta is presently equivalent to State recommendations of \$1,200. Murrieta’s median family/household income is about \$80,000. Larger median family/household incomes would allow larger city council stipends. This gives the City Council an incentive to improve the economic base of the City of Murrieta.

It was never the intent of the State law for volunteer city council members to receive pensions, club memberships, full medical care, etc. This law would bar the city council of benefits that far exceed the intention of the State Code § 36516. However, this code may allow city council members to receive even greater benefits that are not representative of the people they govern.

Proponents:

Robert (Bob) S. Kowell

Casey A. Evans

Rick E. Reiss

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE “D”

Currently, the Murrieta City Council’s compensation is set by Municipal Code section 2.04.050, which provides as follows:

Pursuant to Section 36516 of the Government Code of the state, as amended, compensation shall be paid to each member of the city council in the amount set forth in the schedule of such section. More particularly, the amount of compensation to be paid to each member of the city council shall be the sum of six hundred dollars (\$600.00) per month in accordance with Government Code Section 36516, based upon written request of the individual council member. The compensation prescribed in this chapter is and shall be exclusive of any amounts payable to each member of the council as reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred by him or her in the performance of official duties for the city; and, accordingly, each member of the council shall receive reimbursement for such actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of official duties of the city, pursuant to the provision of Section 36514.5 of the Government Code, as amended from time to time. Such reimbursement shall be as established by a policy resolution adopted by the city council.

California Government Code section 36516, referenced above, provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) A city council may enact an ordinance providing that each member of the city council shall receive a salary, the amount of which shall be determined by the following schedule:

...

(4) In cities over 75,000 up to and including 150,000 in population, up to and including six hundred dollars (\$600) per month.

Government Code section 36514.5, also referenced above, states that “City council members may be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of official duties. Reimbursement for these expenses is subject to Sections 53232.2 and 53232.3.”

City Council members currently receive a stipend of \$600 per month plus benefits and reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses. Measure “D” would limit all compensation of City Council members, including both salary and benefits but excluding reimbursement, to fifteen percent (15%) of the median/family household income of the people of Murrieta. A legal question exists as to whether the timing and the standard by which such limits will be calculated are adequately defined to permit enforcement.

It is unclear from the terms of Measure “D” when it applies, i.e., whether it applies retroactively or prospectively only. California Government Code section 36516.5 provides that, generally, a change in a city council member’s compensation applies prospectively only. Measure “D” also seeks to require a super-majority (55%) of registered voters to increase the City Council’s compensation. California Government Code section 36516(b) requires a vote of the majority of the electors to change the compensation of city council members. Similarly, subsection (c) of section 36516 provides that, with majority approval, city council compensation may be increased by ordinance or amendment to an ordinance up to 5%. Thus, a legal question exists as to whether portions of Measure “D” conflict with state laws.

/s/ Leslie E. Devaney, City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “D”

The Founders of this nation recognized that compensation should be provided to those that serve the people. The compensation should not be so much that it becomes the motivation for running for office. This ordinance proposes limiting the stipend received by City Council members to fifteen percent (15%) of Murrieta’s annual median household income. In 2008 the median income for Murrieta was \$79,135, as an average between 2006 and 2008, from the US Census website. Using \$79,135, under this initiative, a city councilperson’s compensation would be about \$1,200, a figure consistent with other cities of our size in the State of California. Tying compensation to the people’s income creates an incentive for the City Council members to improve the economic base of the city.

The ordinance would also prohibit benefits, such as medical insurance, life insurance, and pensions. Presently, the stipend and other benefits, such as healthcare, cost the city around \$20,000 per year per councilperson. In addition, there are memberships, travel, contract services, etc, that cost an additional \$30,000 per year per councilman. That’s \$250,000 per year for the entire council.

The proposed cap on City Council benefits would be exclusive of any amounts payable to each City Councilperson as reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred by their official duties for the City. The proposed ordinance requires that such reimbursement be established by a policy resolution adopted by the City Council.

State law shows no intent for volunteer city council members to receive pensions, club memberships or full medical care. This law would bar the city council of benefits that exceed the intention of the State Code § 36516. The proposed ordinance would require that any increase in City Council benefits be by a vote of a super-majority of the registered voters of Murrieta, or 55%.

By: Douglas V. Gibbs,
Candidate For Murrieta City Council

Robert S. Kowell,
Proponent

Patrice C. Lynes,
Candidate For Temecula City Council

Rick Reiss,
Proponent

Casey A. Evans,
Proponent

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “D”

Murrieta will never turn into the charter City of Bell! The State of California limits compensation to our Council as they do for all general law cities. Their \$600 stipend is **exactly per state law**. No fat cats here.

The proponent’s arguments are misleading and outright lies.

Lie – Council members run for office because they make so much money.
Truth – Council members get \$3.75 an hour, less than half of the minimum wage, a stipend, not a salary. They serve more than 40 hours a week, taking time from their regular jobs as policemen, firemen, teachers, and businessmen/women.

Lie – Council gets club memberships.
Truth – No clubs here! Council members represent the City on a variety of county agencies involved with regional planning and implementation issues impacting the City.

Lie – Council receives an additional \$30,000 annually in memberships, travel, contract services, etc.
Truth – Council members receive NO memberships and NO contract services: travel expenses are limited to approved, official City business.

Lie – The measure prohibits health benefits and pensions.
Truth – State Law requires that health benefits be offered and the federal government requires Social Security or an equivalent be paid.

When the proponents lie repeatedly to the public, they are trying to manipulate you. Why? The proponents believe that with this Measure they can break the state law formula for stipends – this is the biggest lie of all. Stop them in their tracks. Vote No on Measure “D”.

By: Larry R. Dean,
Murrieta P.D. Chief (Ret.)

Ruthanne Taylor Berger,
Murrieta Residents

Paul Diffley,
School Board Member

Barbara J. Nugent,
Coordinator Community Cares

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “D”

So, the backers of this initiative want to override the state of California? Murrieta Council members receive a \$600 monthly stipend & limited benefits, all rigidly set by the state of California because Murrieta is a general-law city, a huge difference from the floundering City of Bell, which is a charter city with no such restrictions.

Our Council members are expected to participate in city events, make public appearances, attend designated Riverside County Commissions, appear at school district activities, research issues and be prepared for agenda items and attend regularly scheduled Council meetings to name just a few of their responsibilities. Often the time spent on these totals far more than 40 hours weekly, making this \$600 stipend equivalent to approximately \$3.75 per hour. No fat cats here, no secret club memberships, just working folks trying to make the city a better place for families.

Council members don't receive a salary, and the small state-regulated stipend is intended to offset travel and meeting expenses for council members representing you, the citizens of Murrieta, and working to make sure your City maintains its current level of service.

The few backers of this ill-thought-out initiative intentionally create a false picture of Murrieta's elected council. Among the opponents to this Measure is former Murrieta Fire Chief, Paul Christman. Join Chief Christman and the undersigned and vote NO on this Measure “D”.

By: Paul F. Diffley,
School Board Member

Larry R. Dean,
Murrieta Police Chief (Retired)

Barbara J. Nugent,
Coordinator, Community Cares

Ruthanne Taylor Berger,
Murrieta Resident

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “D”

This measure is endorsed by the National Tax Limitation Committee.

This measure does not override the \$600 councilperson monthly stipend. This measure limits only the perks.

We all agree, including the opposition, that a stipend is meant to offset the costs of a councilperson. Costs such as going to meetings would be included in this stipend. The stipend's name, however, has been changed to salary and wages (see page 39 of the online 2010/2011 proposed budget). Calling it a salary means that the council can add items such as attending meeting to their wages. In addition, the city pays for life insurance, medical, dental, etc. Opponents also fail to mention the perks associated with the council's involvement in the Murrieta Redevelopment Agency and other regional governmental associations.

The total cost for City “salary and wages” is \$20,359.40/councilperson/year alone. In addition, there are meetings, travel, memberships, etc which cost the city an additional \$30,819.60/councilperson/year.

Tying the city council compensation to Murrieta's household income would reduce the city's total cost to \$15,827/ councilman/ year. The city can ask for more, when needed, from the people per this measure. All of us have had to adopt budgets in accordance with the hard times we are facing. The City Council should adapt the same way we have to.

The impartial analysis done by the city attorney is not an impartial analysis. The people who are most affected by this initiative are the ones who approved her position and pay.

By: Richard D. Ackerman, Past President (2008-2010)
Mt. San Jacinto College Foundation

Robert S. Kowell, Chairman, Limited Government PAC

Patrice C. Lynes, Temecula City Council Candidate

Douglas V. Gibbs, Murrieta City Council Candidate

Emilia Rychener, Murrieta City Council Candidate

MEASURE “E” – CITY OF MURRIETA

Limits on City Administration Compensation.

Proposed Initiative: **Limits on City Administration Compensation.**

2.08.030 Compensation.

~~The city manager shall receive such compensation and expense allowances as the city council shall from time to time determine, and such compensation shall be a proper charge against such funds of the city as the council shall designate. (Ord. 3 § 1(part), 1991: prior code § 2.08.030)~~

2.08.040 Expense reimbursement.

~~The city manager shall be reimbursed for all actual and necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his official duties. (Ord. 3 § 1(part), 1991: prior code § 2.08.040)~~

Limits on City Administration Compensation.

Replace 2.08.030 and 2.08.040 with the following: No chief city administrative official(s), including city manager and their direct reports, shall have annual salaries with benefits or a combined hourly rate with overtime and benefits that exceeds a rate of 2.5 times the median family/household income of the people of Murrieta. Benefits include, but are not limited to, car, gas, life insurance, health/medical insurance, and any other personal usage benefits. Fire, police, and other emergency public safety personnel are excluded from this initiative. This law would be waived during States of Emergency except those that are budgetary or administrative in nature.

Reasons:

Murrieta's city manager makes a monthly salary of \$17,500 per month (\$210,000 annually) with full benefits. Murrieta exceeds the maximum for a city manager for a city of our size by almost a factor of two (payscale.com). The U.S. President makes \$400K/yr, the U.S. Vice President makes \$212,100/yr, the U.S. Chief Justice makes \$212,100/yr, and a U.S. Senator or Representative makes \$165,200. The average VP of Human Resources for a non-profit organization makes about \$93K. General Petraeus, head of the Iraq and Afghan American forces, makes roughly \$180K a year give or take ten or twenty thousand dollars due to combat pay. City Manager salaries are a symptom of a run-away government that needs to be limited.

The present median family income for a family/household in Murrieta is approximately \$80,000 per year. No city manager nor their direct reports should receive a salary and/or hourly rate plus benefits exceeding 2.5 times the city's annual median family income per year. This will put the city manager's salary with benefits at or around \$200K per year. This proposal will redefine the focus of city management to work harder in attracting higher end jobs and businesses, as well as put an end to out of control government salaries while allowing just compensation for the average city employee, policeman, fireman, and/or other emergency personnel.

Proponents:

Robert (Bob) S. Kowell

Casey A. Evans

Rick E. Reiss

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE “E”

Currently, the Murrieta City Manager's compensation is set by the City Council, as authorized by Municipal Code section 2.08.030, entitled, “Compensation,” which provides as follows:

The city manager shall receive such compensation and expense allowances as the city council shall from time to time determine, and such compensation shall be a proper charge against such funds of the city as the council shall designate.

The City Council is authorized to determine the salary of the City Manager and other such employees pursuant to California Government Code section 36506, which states that “By resolution or ordinance, the city council shall fix the compensation of all appointive officers and employees. Such officers and employees hold office during the pleasure of the city council.”

Based on the above authority, the City Council currently fixes the compensation of the City Manager. Measure “E” would limit the compensation of the City Manager and his “direct reports” to 2.5 times the median family/household income of the people of Murrieta, including both salary and benefits. Measure “E” reads as follows:

No chief city administrative official(s), including city manager and their direct reports, shall have annual salaries with benefits or a combined hourly rate with overtime and benefits that exceeds a rate of 2.5 times the median family/household income of the people of Murrieta. Benefits include, but are not limited to, car, gas, life insurance, health/medical insurance, and any other personal usage benefits. Fire, police, and other emergency public safety personnel are excluded from this initiative. This law would be waived during States of Emergency except those that are budgetary or administrative in nature.

Thus, for example, if the median family/household income of the people of Murrieta was \$100,000, the City Manager's compensation (and that of his “direct reports”) would be limited to \$250,000 each: \$100,000 x 2.5 = \$250,000.

A legal question exists as to whether the timing and the standard by which such limits will be calculated are adequately defined to permit enforcement. Additionally, a legal question exists as to whether the people to which Measure “E” applies are adequately defined to permit enforcement. Relatedly, because some of the people to which Measure “E” applies may be subject to existing employment contracts or collective bargaining agreements, a legal question exists as to the effect of Measure “E” on such contracts or collective bargaining agreements. Finally, because Government Code section 36506 vests in the City Council the right to hire and provide compensation for appointed officers and employees of the City, a legal question exists as to whether Measure “E” is a proper delegation of the City Council's discretion.

/s/ Leslie E. Devaney, City Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “E”

“We The People of Murrieta” propose that the city administration salaries be tied to the city’s financial performance through Measure “E”. Allowing large salaries for city administrations was never the intention of our Founding Fathers. We are not or should not be a nation of bureaucrats but a nation built on the ideas of freedom first. It is called public service.

By limiting the salary of our administrative officials, and linking their salary to the city’s median household income, it encourages city management to work toward attracting higher end jobs and businesses to our region, as well as put an end to out of control government salaries while allowing just compensation for the city employee, policeman, fireman, and other emergency personnel.

This ordinance excludes fire, police, and other emergency personnel.

Murrieta’s city manager made a monthly salary of \$17,500/ month (\$210,000 annually) in 2008 plus benefits. The average salary for a city manager in our area is now \$172,207 (www.payscale.com). This is a Harvard master’s grad in business with 30 years experience as a city manager.

The U.S. President makes \$400,000/yr, the Vice President makes \$212,100/yr, and a Senator or Representative makes \$165,200. In 2007, General Petraeus, head of the Iraq and Afghan American forces, made roughly \$180,000/year while overseeing over 160,000 U.S. troops.

No city administration official, by this ordinance, shall receive a salary plus benefits exceeding 2.5 times the city’s annual median household income per year (\$79,135 as an average between 2006 and 2008 from the US Census website). This will cap the city manager’s salary with benefits at or around \$200,000/year.

High salaries of administrative officials is a symptom of a run-away government, and this proposed ordinance will be a part of returning control of local government to where it belongs, the people.

By: Robert S. Kowell,
Proponent

Casey A. Evans,
Proponent

Richard D. Ackerman
Attorney at Law

Rick Reiss,
Proponent

Douglas V. Gibbs,
Murrieta City Council Candidate

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “E”

The Proponents are being hypocritical, claiming to adhere to free market principles, but are proposing a complex formula to manipulate **all** City salaries.

Fact: Murrieta voters identified Public Safety as the #1 priority in every survey taken in Murrieta.

Fact missing: Police and Fire cannot be exempted, this measure drives a stake through the heart of public safety in Murrieta.

Fact missing: Proponents failed to take into account that the City of Murrieta has a 5% differential pay scale between the City Manager and his direct employees, including public safety.

Fact missing: Their formula is unworkable. It lowers salaries, destroying public safety through a steady loss of quality Police and Fire personnel.

Their argument is ridiculous: they are not eliminating bureaucracy, they are creating more bureaucracy by adding another layer of government.

Fact: The people elect the Council; their vote empowers the Council to act on their behalf. No runaway government here! Murrieta government is already in the hands of the people.

Fact: Our City Manager’s salary is solidly in the mid-range of similar size cities in the region. You don’t want an inexperienced rookie learning on the job.

Fact: Murrieta is one of the safest cities in the United States according to FBI statistics.

This Measure’s formula discourages retention and advancement and will make it difficult to attract high quality employees, especially Police and Fire personnel.

Oppose this subversive threat to the viability of our City and the safety of our citizens. Vote NO on Measure “E”.

By: Larry R. Dean,
Murrieta P.D. Chief (Ret.)

Ruthanne Taylor Berger,
Murrieta Resident

Paul Diffley,
School Board Member

Barbara J. Nugent,
Coordinator Community Cares

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “E”

Free-market scenario: if an inexperienced plumber showed up on your doorstep with only a toolkit and a smile, you'd turn him away in a heartbeat, even if he promised to do the job for half the cost of a professional plumber. You don't want the inexperienced rookie “learning” his skills on your precious plumbing.

Restricted liberty scenario: you have to hire the rookie and hope for the best.

The same is true of a City Manager position; experience in managing a 100,000-population city demands a high level of expertise and is not the place for learning on the job. Murrieta had some difficult experiences as it grew, with managers who lacked the expertise to cope with medium-size-city problems.

Expertise requires a fair market salary; one gets what one pays for. Pay a little, get a rookie; pay a competitive rate, get an expert. Murrieta has the best and the brightest, in City Manager, Fire Chief and Police Chief. Their compensation is just and equitable for the experience they all bring to their positions.

For example, out of 43 southern California cities, Murrieta's City Manager ranks 28th in salary, and he has voluntarily taken a 5% pay cut to help out in these tough times. Eliminate the free market and the first casualty will be your city of Murrieta. Destroy fair compensation and our skilled and talented employees will leave in droves for better, more equitable opportunities. Among community leaders against Measure “E” is former Murrieta Fire Chief, Paul Christman. Join Chief Christman and the undersigned and vote NO in order to keep our experienced, dedicated professionals on the job.

By: Paul F. Diffley,
School Board Member

Larry R. Dean,
Murrieta Police Chief (Retired)

Barbara J. Nugent,
Coordinator, Community Cares

Ruthanne Taylor Berger,
Murrieta, Resident

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “E”

This measure is endorsed by the National Tax Limitation Committee.

Hiring city administration at any price is what got Bell in trouble. Our city manager, at \$210,000/year, makes more than Arnold Schwarzenegger's salary of \$173,987/year. The speaker of the California Assembly makes \$109,584/year. While millions of average citizens are losing their jobs, public servants enjoy unprecedented salaries while on the tax dole.

The opponent's example of hiring an inexperienced plumber, or in this case, "city manager" doesn't hold water (pun intended). Hiring from an inner circle of bureaucrats doesn't help Murrieta. More importantly, opponents have apparently forgotten that just like the plumber, we get to decide what services we need, who the plumber is, and what they should be paid compared to others.

What is needed is to hire those from the private sector that know business and not bureaucracy and will bring jobs and business to our city.

We won't be alone in this effort to bring down city management salaries. Other cities are starting to adopt similar policies. Had the City of Bell and others considered this years ago, they would not be facing the present situation.

If salaries stay high, then, instead of little Johnny aspiring to start a business to be a success, he should aspire to work for the government; not out of duty or pride but because they pay more.

And again, the impartial analysis done by the city attorney is not an impartial analysis. The City pays her.

By: Richard D. Ackerman, Past President (2008-2010)
Mt. San Jacinto College Foundation

Robert S. Kowell, Chairman, Limited Government PAC

Patrice C. Lynes, Temecula City Council Candidate

Douglas V. Gibbs, Murrieta City Council Candidate

Emilia Rychener, Murrieta City Council Candidate

FROM

DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?



FIRST
CLASS
POSTAGE

PLACE STAMP HERE

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
2724 GATEWAY DRIVE
RIVERSIDE CA 92507-0923



NOTICE TO THE VOTER WITH SPECIAL NEEDS:

A "YES" or "NO" printed under the disabled symbol/arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet indicates whether or not your assigned polling place is accessible to physically disabled voters. Please be advised of the following alternate ways you may cast your ballot.

- **By mail.** You may request a vote-by-mail ballot. Simply complete the application on the back cover of this pamphlet. The application must be mailed to reach the Registrar of Voters Office by the deadline given.
- **Early Voting.** You may vote at the Registrar of Voters office located at 2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507, October 4 - November 1 (excluding Holidays), Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Saturdays, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; and Election Day, November 2, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
- **Curbside Voting** on Election Day. If you are unable to enter the polling place due to a physical disability, you may request Curbside Voting at your assigned polling place. Upon arrival at the polling place, you will be allowed to vote in a location as near as possible to the entrance that is accessible to the physically disabled. If you require Curbside Voting, please call 1-877-663-9906 before going to your assigned polling place and/or when you arrive at the facility. An Election Officer will be contacted prior to your arrival to meet you at the curb.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
2724 GATEWAY DRIVE
RIVERSIDE, CA 92507-0918



NONPROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Registrar of Voters
Riverside

VOTE-BY-MAIL BALLOT APPLICATION

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 26, 2010

I hereby request a ballot for the Consolidated General Election, November 2, 2010.

PLEASE PRINT:

NAME AS REGISTERED

RESIDENCE ADDRESS AS REGISTERED

CITY STATE ZIP

MAIL BALLOT TO:

ADDRESS (IF DIFFERENT)

CITY STATE ZIP

☐ ☒ Check this box to request PERMANENT VOTE-BY-MAIL status.

I declare, under penalty of perjury that the information provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

↓ POSTMASTER DELIVER TO ↓

SIGNATURE
REQUIRED

SIGNATURE OF VOTER DATE

33-BCov GENERAL 11-02-10

BALLOT
TYPE 084

✓ You May Cast Your Vote Early

At

THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507

October 4 through November 1 (excluding Holidays)
Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Saturdays, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Election Day November 2
7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

IMPORTANT NOTICE!!!

Accessible Voting Unit available at all polling locations.

TO MARK YOUR VOTE
DRAW A LINE



VOTE!!!

For a demonstration on marking your ballot visit www.voteinfo.net

VOTE EARLY

IT'S QUICK
IT'S EASY

IT'S CONVENIENT

GET OUT OF LINE ON ELECTION DAY!

VOTE-BY-MAIL

↓ LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE ↓



ACCESS?

