



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



SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

RV 110-004

STATE/ESTADO		UNITED STATES SENATE SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS		UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS		MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA DEL ESTADO	
Governor / Gobernador	Vote for One Vote por Uno	United States Senator Senador De Los Estados Unidos	Vote for One Vote por Uno	49th Congressional District Distrito Congresional Núm. 49	Vote for One Vote por Uno	Member of the State Assembly Miembro de la Cámara de Representantes de Estados Unidos	Vote for One Vote por Uno
JERRY BROWN Attorney General of California Procurador General de California	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓	BARBARA BOXER United States Senator Senadora de Estados Unidos	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓
CHELENE NIGHTINGALE Business Owner Propietaria de empresa	↓	Democratic Demócrata	↓	GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT Retired Nurse Enfermera jubilada	↓	Democratic Demócrata	↓
CARLOS ALVAREZ Retail Worker Trabajador de ventas al por menor	↓	American Independent Americano Independiente	↓	DUANE ROBERTS Community Volunteer Voluntario comunitario	↓	American Independent Americano Independiente	↓
LAURA WELLS Financial Systems Consultant Consultora de sistemas financieros	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓	BARBARA BOXER United States Senator Senadora de Estados Unidos	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓
MEG WHITMAN Businesswoman Empresaria	↓	Green Verde	↓	GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT Retired Nurse Enfermera jubilada	↓	Green Verde	↓
DALE F. OGDEN Business Consultant/Actuary Consultor de empresas/Actuario	↓	Libertarian Libertario	↓	DUANE ROBERTS Community Volunteer Voluntario comunitario	↓	Libertarian Libertario	↓
Lieutenant Governor Vicegobernador	Vote for One Vote por Uno	Attorney General Procurador General	Vote for One Vote por Uno	49th Congressional District Distrito Congresional Núm. 49	Vote for One Vote por Uno	Member of the State Assembly Miembro de la Cámara de Representantes de Estados Unidos	Vote for One Vote por Uno
PAMELA J. BROWN Economics Professor Profesora de economía	↓	Green Verde	↓	PETER ALLEN Environmental Energy Attorney Abogado ambiental y de energía	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓
GAVIN NEWSOM Mayor, City and County of San Francisco Alcalde, Ciudad y condado de San Francisco	↓	Democratic Demócrata	↓	KAMALA D. HARRIS District Attorney, City and County of San Francisco Fiscal, Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco	↓	Democratic Demócrata	↓
ABEL MALDONADO Senator/Businessman/Farmer Senador/Empresario/Agricultor	↓	Libertarian Libertario	↓	TIMOTHY J. HANNAN Attorney/Arbitrator/Mediator Abogado/Árbitro/Medador	↓	Libertarian Libertario	↓
JAMES "JIMI" CASTILLO Cultural Spiritual Advisor Asesor espiritual cultural	↓	American Independent Americano Independiente	↓	DIANE BEALL TEMPLIN Attorney/RE Broker Abogada/Corredora de bienes raíces	↓	American Independent Americano Independiente	↓
C. T. WEBER Retired Government Analyst Analista gubernamental jubilado	↓	Republican Republicano	↓	STEVE COOLEY District Attorney, County of Los Angeles Fiscal, Condado de Los Angeles	↓	Republican Republicano	↓
JIM KING Real Estate Broker Corredor de bienes raíces	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓	ROBERT J. EVANS Criminal Defense Lawyer Abogado de defensa penal	↓	Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	↓
	↓		↓		↓		↓

CA33-1-110

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

Secretary of State Secretario de Estado		Vote for One Vote por Uno
American Independent Americano Independiente	MERTON D. SHORT Aviator Aviador	↓
Green Verde	ANN MENASCHE Civil Rights Attorney Abogada de derechos civiles	↓
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	↓
Controllor / Contralor		↓
Libertarian Libertario	ANDREW "ANDY" FAVOR Certified Public Accountant Contador público certificado	↓
Republican Republicano	TONY STRICKLAND State Senator/Businessman Senador estatal/Empresario	↓
Peace and Freedom Paz y Libertad	KAREN MARTINEZ Retired Jubilada	↓
Democratic Demócrata	JOHN CHIANG Controllor Contralor	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	LAWRENCE G. BELIZ Independent Businessman Empresario independiente	↓
Green Verde	ROSS D. FRANKEL Accountant Contador	↓

CA33-1-110

Insurance Commissioner Comisionado de Seguros		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	MIKE VILLINES Businessman/State Assemblyman Empresario/Asambleista del Estado	↓
American Independent Americano Independiente	CLAY PEDERSEN Retail Manager Gerente de ventas al por menor	↓
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	↓
Member, State Board of Equalization District 3 Miembro de la Directiva de Impuestos Sobre Ventas, Uso y Otros Distrito 3		↓
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	↓
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	↓

64th Assembly District Distrito de la Asamblea Núm. 64		Vote for One Vote por Uno
Republican Republicano	BRIAN NESTANDE Assemblyman/Businessman Asambleista/Empresario	↓
Democratic Demócrata	JOSE MEDINA Teacher/College Trustee Maestro/Regente universitario	↓
JUDICIAL / JUDICIAL		↓
VOTE YES OR NO FOR EACH OFFICE VOTE SÍ O NO POR CADA OFICINA		↓
FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF CALIFORNIA POR JEFE PRESIDENTE DE CALIFORNIA		↓
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?		YES Sí NO NO
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT POR JEFE 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

(2BS1)

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

JUDICIAL / JUDICIAL		COUNTY / CONDADO	
VOTE YES OR NO FOR EACH OFFICE		Auditor-Controller / Auditor-Contralor	
VOTE SI O NO POR CADA OFICINA		Vote for One	
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT		Vote por Uno	
POR JUEZ ASOCIADO DE LA CORTE SUPREMA		PAUL ANGULO	
Shall Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, CARLOS R. MORENO be elected to the office for the term provided by law?		Certified Public Accountant	
¿Deberá CARLOS R. MORENO, Juez Asociado de la Corte Suprema, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el período que dispone la ley?		Contador público certificado	
YES		IVAN M. CHAND	
Sí		District Finance Director	
NO		Director de finanzas del distrito	
NO			
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 1		DISTRICT / DISTRITO	
POR JUEZ PRESIDENTE, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 1		VALLEY-WIDE RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT	
Shall Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 1, JUDITH D. MCCONNELL be elected to the office for the term provided by law?		DISTRITO DE RECREACIÓN Y PARQUES DE VALLEY-WIDE	
¿Deberá JUDITH D. MCCONNELL, Juez Presidente de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 1, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el período que dispone la ley?		Director	
YES		Short Term / Plazo Corto	
Sí		Vote for One	
NO		Vote por Uno	
NO		TIMOTHY LANGSTON	
FOR PRESIDING JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 2		Math Teacher	
POR JUEZ PRESIDENTE, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 2		Maestro de matemáticas	
Shall Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, District 4, Division 2, MANUEL A. RAMIREZ be elected to the office for the term provided by law?		STEVE SIMPSON	
¿Deberá MANUEL A. RAMIREZ, Juez Presidente de la Corte de Apelación, Distrito 4, División 2, ser elegida por votación a la oficina por el período que dispone la ley?		Appointed Incumbent	
YES		Titular nombrado	
Sí			
NO			
NO			
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEAL DISTRICT 4, DIVISION 2			
POR JUEZ ASOCIADO, CORTE DE APELACIÓN DISTRITO 4, DIVISION 2			
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 período 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			

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR



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, DIVISIÓN 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, DIVISIÓN 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
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 Maestra/Legisador de California	

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, aplaze 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 state and local revenues. 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



CA33-4-H1

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 SI 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 SI 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 SI 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 SI NO NO

SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

CITY / CIUDAD	
CITY OF MENIFEE / CIUDAD DE MENIFEE	
Y	Shall the permanent annual appropriations limit of the City of Menifee be set at \$25,794,387? ¿Deberá fijarse el límite de asignaciones anuales permanentes de la Ciudad de Menifee en \$25,794,387?
	YES SÍ
	NO NO
Z	Shall the following ordinance be adopted: Any Councilmember who has served two successive terms or eight consecutive years shall be ineligible to serve again in that office until an intervening period of two years has elapsed. Any Councilmember who serves for two or more years of an appointed or elected term shall be considered to have served a term. Terms completed prior to this measure taking effect shall not be counted in determining eligibility. ¿Deberá ser adoptada la siguiente ordenanza? Cualquier Concejal que haya ocupado su cargo por dos periodos consecutivos u ocho años consecutivos no será elegible para ocupar dicho cargo otra vez hasta que haya transcurrido un periodo intermedio de dos años. Se considerará que cualquier Concejal que sirva dos años o más de un periodo nombrado o electo sirvió un periodo. No se contarán los periodos completados antes de la vigencia de esta medida para determinar la elegibilidad.
	YES SÍ
	NO NO
AA	Shall the following ordinance be adopted: Commencing with the 2012 General Municipal Election, shall four (4) members of the City Council of the City of Menifee be elected by four (4) districts as described in this ballot measure and the Mayor of the City of Menifee be elected on a citywide basis by the voters of the entire City? ¿Deberá ser adoptada la siguiente ordenanza? Comenzando con la elección municipal general de 2012, deberán ser elegidos por votación cuatro (4) miembros del Concejo Municipal de la Ciudad de Menifee por cuatro (4) distritos, tal como se describe en esta medida de boleta, y deberá ser elegido por votación en general el alcalde de la Ciudad de Menifee por todos los votantes de toda la Ciudad?
	YES SÍ
	NO NO
BB	The term of office of any elected Mayor shall be? (vote for only one) El periodo de cualquier alcalde electo deberá ser de (vote por sólo uno)
	FOUR (4) YEARS CUATRO (4) AÑOS
	TWO (2) YEARS DOS (2) AÑOS
CC	The salary per year of any elected Mayor shall be? (vote for one only) El salario anual de cualquier alcalde electo deberá ser de (vote por sólo uno)
	\$8,000 YEAR \$8,000 POR AÑO
	\$10,000 YEAR \$10,000 POR AÑO
DD	Shall the members of the legislative body of the City of Menifee be elected at large? ¿Deberán ser elegidos los miembros del cuerpo legislativo de la Ciudad de Menifee por votación general?
	YES SÍ
	NO NO

CA33-4-H1



SAMPLE BALLOT/BOLETA EJEMPLAR

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
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY,
64TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT**

BRIAN NESTANDE, Republican

AGE: 46

OCCUPATION: Assemblyman / Businessman

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

B.S. from California State University, Fullerton

It has been my honor to represent you in the State Assembly during my first term in office. Over the course of that time, I voted to cut almost \$20 billion to help balance the budget without increasing taxes; however more cuts are still needed. We must reduce the influence of Sacramento and restore local government control.

California has the worst credit rating in the United States. Therefore, I have introduced legislation to require more transparency in state government by requiring the state to list all of its liabilities (estimated to be \$200 billion) in the budget and provide a path to pay down the debts. My legislation also prohibits the state from using accounting gimmickry to balance the budget. By reducing spending and having a more transparent and honest budget, I believe we can improve our credit rating and save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

I will be fighting hard this year where it matters most – job creation. I received a 100 percent pro-jobs rating from the National Federation of Independent Business and an “A” rating from the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association. I am determined to put Californians back to work.

Our state is facing a massive budget deficit this year. I took the initiative to cut my own pay and I refused to take a state car allowance. I am committed to making hard budget choices to get our economy back on track. Thank you for your support.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY,
64TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT**

JOSE MEDINA, Democratic

AGE: 57

OCCUPATION: Teacher

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

As a lifelong educator, former school board member, and current Trustee for the Riverside Community College District, I am well aware of the challenges confronting our region. Riverside County has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country, our state is ranked last in education, and our budget deficit continues to rise. We cannot continue along this path. We need practical and sensible representation in Sacramento that puts your interests first!

As an assemblyman, my first priority is to create jobs. In order to reignite our economy and strengthen our region we must invest in a strong workforce and provide incentives to draw businesses to our area. Throughout my career I have worked with Independents, Republicans and Democrats to arrive at common sense and realistic solutions to challenging issues. I will use this same approach in Sacramento.

As your Assemblyperson I will work to:

- GENERATE NEW JOBS
- Create a quality and affordable K-16 educational system
- Eliminate the budget deficit
- Protect home ownership
- Support small businesses
- Defend senior interests
- Push for alternative, sustainable energy sources
- Find a long-term water solution
- Protect the environment

Having taught at College of the Desert, RCC, and currently at Riverside Unified School District, I see the great potential of our state, even during tough times. Join me in fighting for practical, cost-effective solutions to address the needs of our community and our state.

I respectfully ask for your vote.

www.medinaforasassembly.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 DIRECTOR, VALLEY-WIDE RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT, SHORT TERM STEVE SIMPSON AGE: 47 OCCUPATION: Optometrist / Appointed Incumbent EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS: My wife and I have lived in the valley 19 years. We have two children, both whom have benefited from programs offered by Valley-Wide. I currently serve as a director on the Valley-Wide Board of Directors. I am also a member of the Hemet-San Jacinto Exchange Club, a Board member for the Hemet Hospital Foundation, a member of the Action Group, and a past member of the Ramona Pageant Association Board. I have been involved with Valley-Wide for several years through mine and my children's participation in the sports programs as well as with fundraising events such as The Weekend and Autumn Elegance. I believe that participation in positive sports and recreation programs play an integral part in the lives of our community members—youth specifically. I am an Optometrist and have had a practice in the valley since 1992. I hold a Doctorate of Optometry from Indiana University, and a Bachelor of Science degree from Western Kentucky University. As a Board member I will strive to provide access to quality parks, and sports and recreation programs to the citizens of the District; resulting in enhanced active lifestyles for all. Please vote, Steve Simpson, on November 2, 2010. Thank you.	

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

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "Y"

Article XIIB and state law require that each public agency adopt an "appropriations limit," (also called a "Gann limit") which limits the "proceeds of taxes" that the public agency may receive to the amount adopted by the public agency. "Proceeds of taxes" generally means all taxes and subventions received by that public agency, subject to specific constitutional exceptions. Proceeds of taxes received by the public agency in excess of the limit must be returned.

At the time the City of Menifee was incorporated, the provisional appropriations limit, was set by LAFCO at \$26,049,674 and enacted as part of the incorporation of the City of Menifee by the voters in 2008.

Under the provisions of Government Code Section 56812, newly incorporated cities operate under the provisional appropriations limit set by LAFCO as a condition of incorporation until that limit is adjusted as permitted by law. Newly incorporated cities are then required to determine a permanent appropriation limit to be submitted to the voters at the first election after the first full fiscal year of incorporation. This November 2010 election is the first election after the City's first fiscal year. State law requires the permanent limit to be computed by adjusting the provisional limit for population increases or decreases and actual proceeds of taxes received.

The proposed permanent limit in Measure "Y" is \$25,794,387 which is \$255,287 less than the provisional limit adopted by the voters in 2008.

The permanent limit will be adjusted annually using factors for changes in population and change in income as provided in state law. If Measure "Y" is not adopted, the provisional limit will remain in place unless and until a permanent limit is adopted by the voters.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "Y". If you desire a copy of the ordinance or measure, please call the elections official's office at (951) 672-6777 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

NO ARGUMENTS FILED IN FAVOR OR AGAINST MEASURE "Y"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "Z"

Measure "Z" proposes to limit Menifee City Councilmembers to two consecutive terms on the City Council, or eight years. In other words, after being elected twice to two (2) four-year terms, a councilmember could not run for a third term until an intervening period of two years has elapsed. In addition, if a councilmember was serving, whether elected or appointed to fill a vacancy, and the remaining term to be served was for two (2) or more years, that time would count as one term. In that case, the councilmember could only be elected for one additional term, for a maximum of six or seven rather than eight years. After serving the maximum length of time, a councilmember would be required to have a break in service of two (2) years before again running for election to the Council or being eligible for appointment to the Council.

This Measure "Z" would apply whether or not councilmembers are elected by district or at large. This Measure "Z" would apply to a councilmember whether elected by the voters or, if there is a vacancy, appointed by the remaining councilmembers. If passed, this Measure "Z" would not apply to councilmember terms completed prior to the November 2010 election.

Measure "Z" would have no economic effect with regard to election cost to the City.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "Z". If you desire a copy of the ordinance or measure, please call the elections official's office at (951) 672-6777 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “Z”

Honest, responsible representation in Menifee city government is vital to our city's success and prosperity. Limiting the length of time our council members serve on the city council is an important step towards ensuring that representation.

Term limits break ties between council members and special interests. They help to ensure that council members are re-elected because of their record and service to the community, not because of name recognition, power, or money. Moreover, term limits provide a measure of assurance that candidates, knowing that a council seat is *not* a career position, will run for the right reasons. The city is best served by people who put our community ahead of personal ambition, and who vote on principle.

A term-limited, citizen council will lead to better decisions for our city. Forcing incumbents to step down after a second term encourages more citizen participation which translates into new ideas, different approaches to solving problems, and fresh perspectives.

We argue that term limits will reduce wasteful spending, thereby reducing taxes. Career council members up for re-election are incentivized to spend tax money on items within their own district, whether needed or not, to show accomplishment. Term-limited council members would not have this incentive.

And finally, we argue that term limits would increase voter participation in elections. New names and faces in competition without established incumbents will generate more interest among the electorate.

Our young city of Menifee deserves a city council that is responsive and accountable to the citizens, one that is free from ties to special interests and not influenced by lobbyists. We deserve a council that is free from corruption and self-serving politicians, one that will make decisions that are in *our* best interest, not theirs.

Please vote YES for term limits. Vote YES on Measure “Z.”

By: John D. Smelser – Menifee Citizen

Ken Laymon – Retired Chemist

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “Z”

Term Limits are BAD IDEA is because it LIMITS the CHOICES of candidates the public is allowed to vote for. If you have a really good public servant and you want to keep them, you can't. You have to get rid of the good public servant and replace them with someone who's inexperienced. Brand new cities need continuity and stability.

By having term limits, we are eliminating the public servants who have wisdom and experience from political life. Like any job, it takes years to be good at what you do. About the time our elected officials have become good public servants, we're required to throw them out.

And what is the advantage of that? Well, for the uninformed voters it creates change for people who don't care enough to find out what the issues are. Term limits laws are an acknowledgement by the voters that they are too lazy to make an informed decision at the ballot box.

It doesn't matter how much money a candidate spends, when you go into vote there's no one holding a gun to your head making you vote for the candidate who spent the most money or who spent the most money or who is already in office. Believe it or not, you have free will. You can vote these people out!

We already have Term Limits, they are called ELECTIONS!

VOTE NO on MEASURE “Z”

By: Matthew Liesemeyer,
City of Menifee Planning Commission

Betty Bouris,
Menifee Valley Historical Association

Lynn Mattocks,
Retired U.S. Marine + Menifee Rancher

Ken Gaunt,
Sun City Resident, Ret. County Commissioner

Dawn Prather,
Co-Founder Arts Council Menifee

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “Z”

Most often, term limits for elected officials are put in place by the voters to prevent members of an elected body from becoming career politicians. In a large city where the City Councilmembers are full time positions with substantial salaries, term limits may be an appropriate limitation, but not for a new city just starting out.

The City of Menifee is a general law city with a City Manager form of government. The City Council hires the City Manager and the City Attorney and the City Manager as CEO runs the city government and is accountable to the City Council. The Menifee City Council are **Part-Time Citizen Representatives** elected by the voters and receive a stipend of about \$500.00 a month to oversee the government operation.

To restrict the terms of the Menifee City Council would create a revolving door at City Hall that would produce uncertainty among employees and staff and those looking to do business in Menifee. It would also limit the knowledge and stability of the more experienced members who make decisions on a longer time horizon that prove to be more accountable to local residents.

History has shown us that Term Limits have been a failure in the State of California and should NOT be considered for the City of Menifee.

Elections every 2 years are the way voters determine who should serve on our Council, NOT Term Limits. For a new city the size and structure of Menifee, term limits are unwarranted and should be rejected.

VOTE NO on MEASURE “Z”!

By: Matthew Liesemeyer,
Chairman, City of Menifee Planning Commission

Betty Bouris,
Menifee Valley Historical Association

Dawn Prather,
Co-Founder Arts Council Menifee

Ken Gaunt,
Sun City Resident + Retired County Commissioner

Lynn Mattocks,
Retired U.S. Marine + Menifee Rancher

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “Z”

- The argument that term limits are unnecessary for small or new cities is specious. Witness the City of San Jacinto where four council members were indicted last fall on 155 counts of everything from money laundering and bribery to fraud (Press Enterprise, November 13, 2009). And what about the corruption in the City of Bell? Do we want the same thing in Menifee? Term limits prevent people from becoming long-tenured, corrupt politicians, regardless of the city's age or government structure.
- “**Part-Time Citizen Representatives**” can become just as corrupt as full-time representatives if they stay in office long enough. Term Limits give citizens another tool in the fight for responsible representation.
- Two four-year terms or eight years in office for a council member is *not* a revolving door. Moreover, politicians are not the only ones with knowledge or experience, but they are frequently the ones displaying arrogance and elitism. Term limits help provide a true citizen council.
- Term limits, in Sacramento or anywhere else, are not perfect, but they are an essential tool in today's political climate. California's failure has more to do with politicians than with term limits.
- Council members serve *four*-year terms, not two. Elections and election cycles have nothing to do with term limits.
- The fact that just two citizens collected nearly 6,000 signatures to put Measure “Z” before the voters says more about term limits than does the opponents' list of connected players who oppose them.

Vote YES on Measure “Z.”

By: John D. Smelser – Menifee Citizen

Ken Laymon – Retired Chemist

MEASURE “AA” – CITY OF MENIFEE

Initiative Measure Mayor Elected at Large and four by District council members

Commencing with the 2012 General Municipal Election, shall four (4) members of the City Council of the City of Menifee be elected by four (4) districts as described in this ballot measure and the Mayor of the City of Menifee be elected on a city wide basis by the voters of the entire City? Yes___ or No___ The term of office of any elected Mayor shall be? (Vote for only one) Four (4) years___ Two (2) years___ the salary per year of any elected Mayor shall be? (Vote for only one) \$8,000 year___ \$10,000 year___

District 1

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the Intersection of Goetz Rd and Ethanac Rd inside the city border proceed easterly on Ethanac and Southerly along Barnett Rd and the city border then continue southerly on Barnett Rd to intersection of Barnett Rd and Rouse Rd meet and proceed easterly to the west side of Interstate 215. Proceed Southerly along interstate 215 to Newport Rd and proceed westerly along Newport Rd and north easterly along Murrieta Rd and proceed west northerly side of Ridgemoor Rd and proceed northerly on Valley Blvd and east, on southerly side of Mc Call Rd and proceed north, easterly side of Murrieta Rd and proceeding westerly on Chambers Ave northern side of Rd and encompassing all land within the city boundary on the northern, westerly to La Ladera Rd and proceed north along the city border, La Ladera Rd to Goetz Rd and proceed to intersection of Ethanac Rd, Goetz, and city border.

DISTRICT 2

The region boundary and described as follows: Beginning at the Intersection of La Ladera Rd and the city boundary with the City of Perris, encompassing all land north, easterly to chambers Ave, proceed easterly, southerly side along Chambers, and south, western side of Murrieta Rd, proceed west on the northern side of McCall to termination and south on Valley Blvd, proceed on the western side of Valley Blvd., and easterly on Ridgemoor on the southern side of the Rd, and southerly on Murrieta Rd on the western side of the Road then proceed easterly on Holland on the southern side of the road and southerly on Bradley Rd on the western side of the road. Bradley Rd turns into Garbani Rd, proceed to Haun Rd, south and western side of road and proceed westerly on Wickerd Rd northern side and southerly on Bradley Rd, western side of the road and proceed easterly on Scott Rd to the Interchange of Interstate 215 and Scott Rd, and south along the western side of Interstate 215 to Keller Rd and proceed along the city border and Keller Rd west to city border. Proceed northerly along city border and Sunset Ave. to Holland Rd and westerly on Holland Rd within the City border to were it meets the Boundary of the City of Lake Elsinore and meets the boundary of city of Canyon Lake to the west, proceed north on Goetz Rd , proceeding west of Goetz Rd and following Vista Way west to Hecht Rd and the city boundary of Menifee and the city of Canyon Lake then proceed easterly along the border of Kabian County Park and the city border then northerly along the city border at Kabian County Park and the city boundary of Menifee and the City of Perris, proceed easterly, southerly, westerly, easterly southerly, easterly along the city borders to the intersection of La Ladera Rd and the city border proceed northerly along the city border and La Ladera and city boundary of Perris.

DISTRICT 3

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the Intersection of Murrieta Rd and Newport and proceeding southerly, easterly, along Murrieta Rd, and easterly along Holland Rd and southerly along Bradley Rd., turns into Carbani Rd continue south along Haun Rd, and proceed Southerly to Wickerd Rd and proceed westerly on Wickerd Rd, Southerly on Ascot Way to Scott Rd proceed easterly to Interstate 215 and proceed across Interstate 215 and encompassing all area's within the city boundary east and south of Scott Rd to Menifee Rd and proceeding north inside the city border to Scott Rd and south to Lindenburger Rd within the City boundary and easterly along Camino De Los and Los Caballos and proceed easterly on golden J Ln and southerly on Brandon Ln and southerly inside the city boundary and east on Keller inside the city boundary and north on Leon Rd. inside the city boundary and westerly on Scott Rd and northerly on Briggs road inside the Ctiy boundary and west on Simpson Rd and southerly on Linderberger Rd and westerly on Newport Rd and proceed northerly on Menifee Rd and westerly on southern side of Aldergate Rd. to Antelope Rd, and along the eastern side of Interstate 215 and proceed Southerly along Interstate 215 to Newport Rd, and westerly to Intersection of Newport Rd and Murrieta Rd.

DISTRICT 4

The region bounded and described as follows: Beginning at the intersection of Barnett Rd and Mc Laughlin Rd, proceed southerly, easterly on Barnett Rd and easterly on Rouse Rd across to the eastern side of interstate 215 and proceeding southerly along interstate 215 to were the intersection of Antelope Rd and Allergate Rd meet at the (Oasis gated community) and proceed easterly and northerly on Allergate Rd. Oasis community and beyond on northern side of Allergate Rd, to Menifee Rd proceed southerly on Menifee Rd and proceed easterly on Newport Rd, and proceed northerly on Linderberger Rd and easterly on to Simpson Rd inside the City border and northerly on Briggs Rd inside the city limits and proceed northerly to Mapps Rd and proceed weasterly on Mapps Rd, along the city border with Perris to Trumble Rd and proceed Southerly on Trumble Rd, inside of the city border to Ethanac Road, proceed west to were Trumble Rd, continues, proceed southerly inside the city border to Mc Laughlin Rd and Trumble Rd intersection and proceed west on Mc Laughlin Rd to the interesection of Barnett Rd and Mc Laughlin Rd meet.

POP=16095



IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE “AA”

Measure “AA” proposes to change the election of city councilmembers from “by (5) districts” to election “by (4) districts” with the election of a Mayor “at large.”

Also on the ballot is a measure for “at large” (Measure “DD”) which conflicts with this Measure “AA” (election by districts). Pursuant to Election Code Section 9221, if two ordinances adopted at the same election conflict, the ordinance receiving the highest number of affirmative votes will control. If neither ordinance receives a majority vote, then the current system of selecting a councilmember by five districts will continue.

At the time of incorporation in June, 2008, the initial city councilmembers were elected “at-large,” which meant that each councilmember was voted upon by all voters in the City, in accordance with the law. At the same election, the voters voted that future council elections would be “by five districts.” On August 4, 2009, the City Council passed, approved and adopted Resolution 09-109 which established the five council districts boundaries.

Election of four councilmembers by district: If Measure “AA” is passed, as of the November 2012 general municipal election, the four (4) council districts shown on the map included with this Measure “AA” and described in this Measure “AA” would replace the five (5) council districts adopted by the City Council in August, 2009. Thereafter, there would be an elected Mayor and four councilmembers elected by district. However, state law requires that the City Council review and possibly adjust the boundaries of all council districts after each federal census. Therefore, although there would be four (4) rather than five (5) districts, it is possible that the council districts in 2012 would have adjusted boundaries.

At the 2012 November general municipal election, council members would be elected by districts 1 and 3 for four-year terms. If an incumbent chose to run in 2012, he or she would run in the district where he or she is domiciled after any adjustment in council district boundaries.

There would be no change in the present council district boundaries for the November, 2010 general election at which councilmembers will be elected by Districts 2 and 4. Those council members would continue to serve their four-year terms through November, 2014. This Measure “AA” does not change the terms of office of council members.

Measure “AA” would repeal Resolution 09-109 (which established the five districts.)

A mayor elected at large instead of a fifth (5th) councilmember: This Measure “AA” proposes that Mayor would be elected “at large” instead of a fifth (5th) council member. As of the 2012 general municipal election, the mayor would not be chosen by vote of the other four (4) councilmembers but would be elected at large by a majority vote of all voters within the City.

Changing the method by which City councilmembers are elected has no economic effect with regard to election cost to the City.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "AA"

Vote Yes on Measure "AA". Attached 4-by district map and Street descriptions Shows true and fair representation for ALL the people of Menifee.

Guarantees local representation on the City Council and Council member must live in your district and **are accountable to the people of there district only.**

"4-by district council members" work together to ensure allocation of resources are fairly distributed and the needs of each district are met. **End result whole city represented equally.**

4-By Districts eliminates the influence of special interest, and traditional "power brokers" are kept in check.

The opposite is said of an "at large" council as they are prone to bend to the Special interest groups.

The **Four By Districts and Mayor at large** is a good form of governance for a city of Menifee's size and serves equal, fair, and local representation to the different lifestyles of our diverse communities while maintaining the identity of there neighborhoods.

The Mayor would be elected by all voters of Menifee and would oversee the whole city. Mayor would be answerable to the people of the entire city, not the four city council members.

Impartial analysis statement on measure "AA" second paragraph neglected to state at the incorporation election in June, 2008 **Voters of Menifee were not given a choice on how to elect our present City Council Members.**

AT the 2008 election **Voters were given** the **CHOICE FOR FUTURE ELECTIONS** to pick between "BY DISTRICTS" AND "AT LARGE" OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AND THE **PEOPLES CHOICE WAS "BY DISTRICTS ELECTIONS"**

Measure "AA" does not change the vote of the people in 2008 but creates equal local representation with 4-BY DISTRICTS & a MAYOR over the whole city. **Yes** on measure "AA" means the peoples voice will once again be heard at city hall.

By: Anne E. Pica,
President of C.F.F.R.

Chuck Reutter,
President Menifee/Perris Democratic Club

Ruth Goulet,
S.C.C.A. Member

Greg August,
Real Estate Broker

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "AA"

This election is a prime example of why voters should REJECT DISTRICTS. Two Council Seats are up for election and more than 50% of all residents will not have Council Candidates on their ballot and will not have the right to vote for any Councilmembers. The Anti-City special interests want to LIMIT YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE.

Districts DIVIDE the City and limit the VOTERS CHOICES. By District only allows you to vote for ONE member of the City Council. AT LARGE allows you to vote for ALL city council candidates.

In the initial election the residents chose districts and the Cities of Goleta, Oakley and Wildomar all placed ballot measures to give the VOTERS a choice of governance. By District elections were rejected and repealed by those residents who became better educated on how districts would affect their new city. VOTERS chose AT LARGE because it was the best way to represent to represent ALL citizens.

BY DISTRICTS is a BAD CHOICE

DISTRICTS COST TAXPAYERS more money, \$18,000 in 2009!
DISTRICTS LIMIT VOTERS RIGHTS
DISTRICTS DIVIDE our CITY
SEPARATE MAYOR adds no value and COSTS MORE

By reviewing the facts and the Blue Ribbon Committee Report on Governance voters will determine that AT LARGE is the best choice for a new city the size of Menifee.

VOTE NO on "AA", VOTE NO on DISTRICTS
Measures "AA", "BB" & "CC" all COST taxpayers more money.

VOTE YES on "DD", VOTE YES TO UNIFY MENIFEE with AT LARGE ELECTIONS

By: Ronald Ulibarri, MUSD Board Member

William "Bill" Gould, Trustee, Romoland School District

Matthew Liesemeyer, City of Menifee Planning Commissioner

Dawn Prather, Co-Founder Arts Council Menifee

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “AA”

For the following reasons, we the undersigned have taken a position AGAINST Measure “AA” which, if approved by the voters, would establish the election of council members BY districts and a separate mayor:

- The City of Menifee is united city. The issues decided by the council impact the entire community and not one specific District. All the of “By District” options presented and evaluated for DIVIDE the City.
- City of Menifee voters should NOT be limited to voting for only ONE member of the five member Menifee City Council.
- The City of Menifee is a Council-Manager form of government. Mayors generally operate under a Charter City form of government with “executive powers”. An elected Mayor only adds cost and makes no sense.
- History shows that Cities of the size of Menifee the BY DISTRICT electoral system costs taxpayers more money. Cities the size and population of Menifee in DO NOT elect their City Council Members in this manner.
- Districts are required to be of equal in population, if a district has low voter turn-out it may have more representation per capita in one district, violating the ONE PERSON – ONE VOTE principal of democratic elections. There is potential to disenfranchise voters when district boundaries are changed.
- Disharmony and conflict is common when a council member only reports to the voters of one electoral district instead of the entire community, especially in a newly established city.
- In cities that have BY District elections, by law, Districts have to be redrawn every census at the taxpayers expense.

- ✓ VOTE NO TO A DIVIDED CITY
- ✓ VOTE NO ON MORE COST
- ✓ VOTE NO ON LIMITING COUNCILMEMBER CHOICES
- ✓ VOTE “NO” on “AA”

By: Ron Sullivan,
Director-Eastern Municipal Water Dist.

William “Bill” Gould,
Trustee, Romoland School District

Matthew Liesemeyer,
City of Menifee Planning Commissioner

Dawn Prather,
Co-Founder, Arts Council Menifee

Ron Ulibarri,
MUSD Board Member

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE “AA”

VOTE YES ON MEASURE “AA.”

- The City of Menifee is a General Law City and The **Form of Governance is “BY-DISTRICT”**. The people can vote to elect the Mayor at large and four by districts and not over throw the vote of the people in 2008. Measure “AA” gives the power back to all the people and they vote the Mayor into office **not five city council members.**
- **NO HISTORY OR DATA** to backup false statements on argument against measure “AA”. **BUT THERE IS DATA THAT SHOWS BY-DISTRICT REPRESENTATION IS A COST EFFECTIVE FORM OF GOVERNANCE AND OFFERS BETTER REPRESENTATION TO ITS CONSTITUENTS.**
- By-district council members’ work as united fronts to ensure allocations of all resources are fairly and evenly distributed to meet the needs of each district. End result the entire city is represented equally and fairly and **no one is disenfranchised.**
- Statement false that (by-districts) has to be redrawn after every Federal census. Only if there is a massive increase above the 5% deviation in population and even at the end result would be a slight adjustment only in boundaries at minimal cost.
- Vote **“yes”** on measure “AA” for equal, fair, true representation for all your fellow citizens.

A YES VOTE ON MEASURE “AA”-MEANS

- **EQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES**
- **KEEP SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS OUT**
- **EQUAL & FAIR REPRESENTATION FOR ALL THE PEOPLE**
- **THE PEOPLES VOICE WILL ONCE AGAIN BE HEARD AT CITY HALL**

VOTE NO ON MEASURE “DD”

By: Anne E. Pica – President-Citizens For Fair Representation

Greg August

Ruth Goulet

Chuck Reutter

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "BB"

Measure "BB" proposes that the term of any elected mayor would be for either a two-year or four-year term. The term would be determined by majority vote of the voters on this measure.

You may select only one option: four (4) years or two (2) years.

This Measure "BB" would only apply to the mayor elected after the November 2010 election and would apply only if Measure "AA" (election of councilmembers by districts and election of Mayor at large) passes.

Measure "BB" would have no economic effect with regard to election cost to the City.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "BB". If you desire a copy of the ordinance or measure, please call the elections official's office at (951) 672-6777 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "BB"

VOTE FOUR YEARS OR TWO YEARS ON "BB" this would decide the Mayors term of office as chosen by the voters of Menifee.

The voters of Menifee City will decide to elect the Mayor to cover the whole city for either 4 years or 2 years. The voters have two choices on measure "BB" and the highest number of affirmative votes will control the term limit set for the Mayor to serve the whole city in 2012..

Once the voters have determined the Mayors term of office effective in 2012 the process of the City council determining the term of the Mayor would be eliminated.

Instead of the Mayor/Councilman serving his term of office at the will of his fellow council members he would serve either 4 or 2 years as determine by the vote of the people and the Mayor would cover the whole city and not just his district as is now the case.

We recommend voters choose 4 year term for the Mayor of the city as that would give the Mayor ample time to establish a solid foundation as the head of Menifee City.

VOTE 4 OR 2 YEARS ON MEASURE "BB"
THE PEOPLE OF MENIFEE WILL DECIDE THE TERM OF OFFICE FOR THE MAYOR WHO WILL COVER THE WHOLE CITY.

By: Anne E. Pica,
President of C.F.F.R.

Chuck Reutter,
President Menifee/Perris Democratic Club

Greg August,
Real Estate Broker

Ruth Goulet,
S.C.C.A. Member

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "BB"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "CC"

Measure "CC" proposes that the mayor elected at large in 2012 would be paid a salary of either \$8,000 or \$10,000 annually as determined by the voters. This amount would be instead of the current City Council stipend of \$500/month which is set by state law based upon population. This statutory stipend for the four councilmembers would not be changed by this measure.

You may select only one option: \$8,000 or \$10,000.

This Measure "CC" would only apply to the mayor elected after the November 2010 election and would apply only if Measure "AA" (election of councilmembers by districts and election of Mayor at large) passes.

Measure "CC" would increase the salary for serving as Mayor

Although there is no current elected Mayor, the person currently serving as Mayor at the will of City Council is paid \$6,000 annually (councilmember salary). If this Measure is passed, the elected Mayor would no longer be paid as a city councilmember and would instead be paid either (1) \$8,000 or (2) \$10,000 annually depending on the vote.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "CC". If you desire a copy of the ordinance or measure, please call the elections official's office at (951) 672-6777 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "CC"

VOTE \$8,000 OR \$10,000 ANNUAL SALARY ON MEASURE "CC"

There is no current elected Mayor, the person currently serving as Mayor at the will of the City Council is paid a stipend of \$500/month as a council member and is Mayor in his district only.

The stipend is set by state law based upon population. If measure "AA" is passed the fifth council person position will be deleted in 2012.

We will have 4 by districts and Mayor elected at large and salary of the Mayor elected by the people will be determined by the people. The voters will decide whether to pay the at large Mayor position \$8,000 or \$10,000 dollars a year.

The \$500.00 stipend a month for the four council members would not be changed by this measure.

If this measure is passed the Mayor **will no longer be a mayor in name only** he will be a Mayor over the entire city and the people will decide on his salary of either \$8,000 or \$10,000 year.

By: Anne E. Pica,
President of C.F.F.R.

Chuck Reutter,
Pres. Menifee/Perris Valley Dem.

Greg August,
Real Estate Broker

Ruth Goulet,
S.C.C.A. Member

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "CC"

This Measure is a companion to the Measures "AA" and "BB" and should be REJECTED by the voters.

The City of Menifee at this early stage of formation does not benefit from having a separately elected Mayor. The functions and duties of the Mayor under the Council-Manager form of government do not give any Executive Powers to the Mayor.

The powers and duties of the Mayor WILL NOT CHANGE; it will only add cost at the TAXPAYERS EXPENSE! The role of the Mayor in Menifee is simply ceremonial, only large cities like Los Angeles have salaried Mayors.

Menifee is a new city with a five-member elected city council. Menifee is a General Law city, not a Charter City. The Mayor has no Executive Powers and should not be paid a salary. This is a waste of tax dollars and is unnecessary for a NEW city!

The Authors of Measure "AA", "BB" & "CC" all propose MORE COST to the residents of Menifee.

SAY NO TO MORE GOVERNMENT SPENDING!

Say NO to DISTRICTS

Say NO to a SALARIED MAYOR

Say NO to TERM LIMITS

VOTE NO on "AA", "BB" & "CC"

By: Matthew Liesemeyer, City of Menifee Planning Commissioner

William "Bill" Gould, Trustee, Romoland School District

Lynn Mattocks

Ken Gaunt, Ret. County Commissioner Sun City Resident

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "CC"

The City of Menifee is a general law city with a City Manager form of government. The City Council hires the City Manager and the City Attorney and the City Manager as CEO runs the city government and is accountable to the City Council.

Separately elected Mayors generally operate under a Charter City form of government with "executive powers" and an executive salary.

Menifee is not a Charter City and Menifee's Mayor is only ceremonial and does not have any defined authority. There is NO benefit to residents to have a separately elected Mayor. There is only the added expense.

Menifee is too small at this time to have a separately elected Mayor and the taxpayers of Menifee do not need the added cost. An elected Mayor at this time makes no sense at this stage of our city's history.

DO NOT VOTE on MEASURE "CC", VOTE NO on "AA"

By: Ron Sullivan,
Director-Eastern Municipal Water Dist.

William "Bill" Gould,
Trustee, Romoland School District

Matthew Liesemeyer,
Chairman, City of Menifee Planning Commission

Ken Gaunt,
Retired County Commissioner

Lynn Mattocks,
Retire U.S. Marine & Menifee Rancher

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "CC"

- The City of Menifee is a General Law City and the form of government is "BY-DISTRICT". The people voted for by districts in 2008.
- the present System of appointing the Mayor by the city council is ceremonial, Mayor in **name only** who's defined authority is over his district **only** and receives \$500 dollars stipend a month equals \$6,000 dollars a year plus benefits.
- The Mayor elected by the people will represents the **whole city** and is Accountable to the voters not the City Council. The people will decide on the Mayors Salary by voting on Measure "CC" and pick either \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year.
- The city of Menifee has many diverse neighborhoods and a City of this size is ideal for 4-BY DISTRICTS AND THE MAYOR ELECTED AT LARGE.
- It is clear that the 4-BY DISTRICTS AND MAYOR ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE Will benefit the citizens of Menifee and that is why the **Special Interest** groups don't Want to see the people take back the power and vote yes on MEASURE "AA"
- **VOTE YES ON MEASURE "AA" and lock out the Special Interest Groups for Good.**
- **VOTE ON "BB" AND PICK ONLY ONE - 4 YEAR TERM OR 2 YEAR TERM OF OFFICE FOR THE MAYOR**
- **VOTE ON "CC" AND PICK ONLY ONE - \$8,000 OR \$10,000 SALARY PER YEAR**
- **VOTE NO ON MEASURE "DD"**

By: Anne E. Pica,
President of Citizens For Fair Representation

Greg August

Ruth Goulet

Chuck Reutter

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "DD"

Measure "DD" proposes to change election of city councilmembers from "by (5) districts" to "at large."

Measure "DD" is being presented to the voters by the Menifee City Council. Also on the ballot is a measure for districts (Measure "AA") which conflicts with this At-Large measure. Pursuant to Election Code Section 9221, if two ordinances adopted at the same election conflict, the ordinance receiving the highest number of affirmative votes will control. If neither ordinance receives a majority vote, then the current system of selecting a councilmember by five districts will continue.

At the time of incorporation in June, 2008, the initial city councilmembers were elected "at-large," which meant that each councilmember was voted upon by all voters in the City, as required by law. At the same incorporation election, the voters voted that future council elections would be "by five districts." Therefore, on August 4, 2009, the City Council passed, approved and adopted Resolution 09-109 which established the five council districts boundaries.

Election "by district" means that only those persons living in a district are eligible to run for City Council from that district and only those persons living in the district can vote for one candidate for council member from that district.

In an "at large" election system, voters vote on each of the five councilmember seats and anyone who lives in the city may run for City Council. All the people of the city vote for all five members of the City Council.

If implemented, this Measure "DD" would replace the five districts previously adopted by the City Council in August 2009. Instead, all five councilmembers would be elected at large in the same manner as at incorporation. Measure "DD" would repeal Resolution 09-109 (which established the five districts.)

This Measure "DD" does not change how the mayor is chosen, i.e. the mayor would continue to be one of the councilmembers elected by the other councilmembers. This Measure "DD" does not change the terms of office of councilmembers.

This change would take effect 10 days after certification of this November 2010 election and therefore, if approved, will apply to the three councilmembers to be elected at the November, 2012 election.

Changing the method by which members of the City Council are elected has no economic effect with regard to election cost to the City.

By: City Attorney,
City of Menifee

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "DD". If you desire a copy of the ordinance or measure, please call the elections official's office at (951) 672-6777 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “DD”

For the following reasons, we the undersigned have taken a position in FAVOR of Measure “DD” which, if approved by the voters, would allow the citizens of Menifee to return to an AT LARGE election system.

- Menifee Voters should have the privilege of voting for ALL FIVE council members.
- AT LARGE promotes a united community which is more likely to secure funding opportunities, promote the assets of the community and attract new businesses.
- How the elected body makes decisions is determined by its accountability to the residents. AT LARGE keeps all 5 Council members accountable to ALL residents.
- The first Menifee election was AT LARGE, giving voters a say on all council members, and a YES vote on this measure will ensure the EVERY VOTE COUNTS.
- The BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE on GOVERNANCE reviewed all forms of city governance and concluded that AT LARGE effectively served Menifee residents.
- An AT LARGE city council guarantees a focus on the needs of the ENTIRE City of Menifee and not the fractional decision making which happens under other systems.
- Public Safety issues for all of Menifee, including Fire, Police, Public Works, Planning and Code Enforcement will receive greater attention from the five members voted AT LARGE because they will have the interests of the entire city and are held accountable by ALL voters.
- The cost of running city government is historically less when the council members are elected AT LARGE.
- Most cities in California the size of Menifee have their elections AT LARGE because of the efficiency of this form of government.

- ✓ ACCOUNTABILITY
- ✓ EVERY VOTE COUNTS
- ✓ COST EFFECTIVE
- ✓ UNITED COMMUNITY

VOTE YES ON “DD”, VOTE YES ON AT LARGE

By: Ron Sullivan,
Director, Eastern Municipal Water District

William “Bill” Gould,
Trustee, Romoland School District

Eric Kroencke,
Trustee Perris Union High Dist.

Lynn Mattocks,
Retired U.S. Marine + Menifee Rancher

Betti Cadmus,
Chair, Blue Ribbon Committee on Governance

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE “DD”

Not one person has been elected into a District, and the “*argument*” suggests we should return to an at-large system. So much for giving a chance, **to what 5,276 citizens voted for in 2008.**

The argument favoring (measure “DD”) is ***nothing*** more than a published list of pros for at-large elections, ***failing*** to mention any of the cons. The *citizens* of Menifee ***paid*** \$10,000 for a Blue Ribbon Committee Report, whose recommendation, for a Special Election, was ***rejected*** by the city council. The Report ***lists***, citywide focus, and economic development, a ***higher*** priority, and ***more important*** than, ***fair representation***. **By-District Elections** will make, ***fair representation***, the ***highest*** priority.

We are all aware of the ***conditions*** affecting our cities throughout the state. **Government is out of control**, causing ***concern*** and ***worry*** for our families, and future. **By-District Elections** will ***rein*** in, localized power, profligate spending, and development for profit only.

Three residents of Menifee have entered the upcoming election to run ***against*** incumbents. **By-District Elections** will ***afford*** the ***modestly*** financed to run for election, whereas at-large elections can be prohibitively expensive, offering ***more*** advantage to special interest, and the well financed.

Some say that in the first two years Menifee has moved too far, resulting in ***costly*** errors, and ***growing*** disunity. **By-District Elections** will ***slow the pace down***, ***spread representation evenly***, and ***allow more community input*** to neighborhood, infrastructure, and economic development.

Vote NO on (Measure “DD”)... keep the City ... in ... “our hands.”

By: Greg August

Anne E. Pica,
President C.F.F.R.

Ruth Goulet

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "DD"

Vote NO on Measure "DD"

Keep **By-District Elections** and keep government out of the control of Special Interests.

The voters **approved** By- District Elections in 2008. Districts were drawn and approved by the City in 2009, at a cost of eighteen thousand dollars.

We believe, based on the California Voting Rights Act, eventually all California cities will be forced to adopt by-district representation form of governance due to the rapidly changing demographics within the State. The groundwork is laid, the costs paid, and the future is clear. So why not, stay the course, with By- District Elections.

The Menifee City Council, on July 20, gave Measure "DD" a **free pass** to the ballot box, knowing the Measure **failed** to collect the requisite number of signatures to qualify for the ballot, per state law. One would have to wonder why that occurred, **unless** we consider the influence, and pressures of special interests, where the more they build, the more they profit.

If and when the local economy recovers much of Menifee remains open for development. By-District Elections will allow **more** citizen, neighborhood and community input for the development, rather than leave it **all** in the hands of a few, who just might be looking to enrich themselves.

By-District Elections will make it more difficult for special interests to take the City down the path that has plagued, and embarrassed, the City for the past two years. Allegations of corruption, malfeasance, rampant cronyism, city staff comprised **mostly** of people from outside the city, will be **less** likely, under By- District Elections.

Vote NO on Measure "DD" ... allow the **heart and soul** of Menifee to be that of the people, **not**, special interests.

By: Greg August,
Real Estate Broker

Anne E. Pica,
President of C.F.F.R.

Ruth Goulet,
S.C.C.A. Member

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "DD"

We DISAGREE with those OPPOSING Measure "DD" and recommend a YES vote on AT LARGE to assure ACCOUNTABILITY and to SAVE MONEY.

We agree that special interests should not control our city.

Citizens For Fair Representation (CFFR) is a special interest group that has promoted an Anti- City agenda .

- CFFR campaigned AGAINST Cityhood
- OPPOSED the citizens participation on the Blue Ribbon Committee on Governance
- OBJECTED to the City Council for giving the voters a choice of AT LARGE in this election

We agree that DISTRICTS COST TAXPAYERS more money, \$18,000 in 2009!

AT LARGE saves money because drawing new districts every census is not required.

Under existing law, the Cities of Goleta, Oakley and Wildomar all placed ballot measures to give the VOTERS a choice of governance. By District governance was rejected and repealed by those residents who became better educated on how districts would affect their new city. VOTERS chose AT LARGE because it was the best way to represent those new cities and to represent ALL citizens.

Adopt MEASURE "DD" and hold all FIVE members of the Menifee City Council ACCOUNTABLE now and in the future, by assuring that every Menifee voter will have the RIGHT to Vote for EVERY Councilmember as they did when the City was incorporated.

Vote YES on "DD" VoteYES on AT LARGE

By: Betti Cadmus,
Chair, Blue Ribbion Committee on Governance

William "Bill" Gould,
Trustee, Romoland School District

Lynn Mattocks,
Retired U.S. Marine + Menifee Rancher

Eric Kroencke,
Trustee Perris Union High School District



Important Dates!

OCTOBER 4TH
FIRST DAY YOU CAN VOTE

OCTOBER 18TH
CLOSE OF REGISTRATION

OCTOBER 26TH
LAST DAY TO REQUEST A
VOTE-BY-MAIL BALLOT



NOVEMBER 2ND ELECTION DAY
VOTE AT YOUR POLLING PLACE
DROP OFF YOUR BALLOT AT ANY POLLING PLACE
VOTE AT THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE BY 8:00 P.M.

VOTE-BY-MAIL

October 4 thru October 26

HAVE YOU HEARD? VOTING BY MAIL IS...

Early Voting

Available to any voter

Saves time by getting you out of line on Election Day

Your Choice

—Give it a try today



You can request to vote-by-mail in any election or elect to receive all ballots for future elections in the mail.

SAME OFFICIAL BALLOT – AT YOUR CONVENIENCE



Have an idea for a Polling Place location?

SUGGEST A POLLING PLACE

Currently the Registrar's Office has many partners which have served their communities by hosting polling places.



Consider the benefits:

- 💡 Serve your community
- 💡 Promote your business
- 💡 Earn \$25 for using your location
- 💡 Great way to meet your neighbors and friends
- 💡 Gain a greater awareness of the voting process

If you belong to a company, civic group, service club, etc. and you, or someone you know, is interested in allowing use of a facility as a Polling Place, please contact the Registrar of Voters at:

2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA 92507

Call: 951-486-7341 or toll free 1-877-663-9906 Fax: 951-486-7320

E-mail: csaucedo@co.riverside.ca.us

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 110

✓ 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?

