

Touch Screen Voting IN 3 EASY STEPS

Step 1. Activate




ACTIVATE THE MACHINE by inserting the Activation Card into the yellow slot on the lower left-hand side of the machine.

Step 2. Select

MAKE YOUR SELECTION by touching the circle to the right of the candidate or measure of your choice.

A green checkmark will appear in the circle . Repeat this process until you have selected the candidates or measures of your choice. If you make a mistake or change your mind, simply touch the checkmark. It will disappear and you can make a new choice.

To vote for a qualified WRITE-IN candidate, touch the circle to the right of the word Write-In. When the keyboard screen appears, touch the letters of the write-in candidate's name, then touch the "OK" button in the lower right hand corner of your screen to continue.




REVIEW

To **"REVIEW"** your selection(s) at any time prior to casting your vote, simply touch "REVIEW" at the bottom center of the screen.

WHEN YOU ARE SATISFIED WITH YOUR SELECTIONS touch the "NEXT" arrow in the lower right corner of the screen.

NEXT

Step 3. Cast Your Ballot



Once satisfied with your selections touch the yellow square in the middle of the screen to cast your ballot.

You cannot change your mind after the ballot is cast.

BARBARA DUNMORE
Registrar of Voters



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

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
County of Riverside

Dear Riverside County Voter:

The *Presidential* Consolidated General Election contains contests for national and statewide offices, statewide measures, as well as local jurisdictions' candidate contests and measures. As a result, this is an exceptionally long ballot. We want to provide you with all the information you need to make voting as easy and convenient as possible. The following are important voter responsibilities and opportunities:

Sample Ballot: Read your sample ballot carefully and mark it before completing your official ballot. This will allow you to easily and quickly complete your official ballot.

Polling Place: Locate your polling place:

- On the back cover of this pamphlet
- On the Registrar of Voters' web-site www.voteinfo.net
- By calling our toll-free number 1-800-773 -VOTE (8683)

In a hurry? Expedite your time at the poll by avoiding peak voting hours. Most votes are cast in the first hours after polls open and right before they close.

Early Voting: The opportunity to cast your ballot on touchscreen before Election Day will be offered for voters' convenience at the following locations:

- Registrar of Voters' Office – October 4 through November 2, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- Four regional satellite locations from October 21 through October 30, 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily and mall hours on weekends:

Galleria at Tyler in Riverside
Hemet Valley Mall


The Promenade in Temecula
Westfield's Shoppingtown in Palm Desert

Last Day to Register: October 18, 2004

Questions: Call 1-800-73-VOTE (8683) or (951) 486-7200, TTY: (951) 653-3718

The Registrar of Voters is dedicated to serving the voters of Riverside County and ensuring the integrity and security of the elections process. We look forward to counting your vote with your participation on November 2, 2004.

Sincerely,


BARBARA DUNMORE
Registrar of Voters

A

OFFICIAL BALLOT
 Consolidated General Election
Riverside County
 November 2, 2004

This ballot stub shall be removed and retained by the voter.

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT		
Vote for One Party		
JOHN F. KERRY , for President JOHN EDWARDS , for Vice President	Democratic	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAVID COBB , for President PAT LA MARCHE , for Vice President	Green	<input type="checkbox"/>
GEORGE W. BUSH , for President RICHARD CHENEY , for Vice President	Republican	<input type="checkbox"/>
MICHAEL BADNARIK , for President RICHARD CAMPAGNA , for Vice President	Libertarian	<input type="checkbox"/>
MICHAEL ANTHONY PEROUTKA , for President CHUCK BALDWIN , for Vice President	American Independent	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEONARD PELTIER , for President JANICE JORDAN , for Vice President	Peace and Freedom	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
UNITED STATES SENATOR		
Vote for One		
JAMES P. "JIM" GRAY , Libertarian Judge		<input type="checkbox"/>
MARSHA FEINLAND , Peace and Freedom Public School Teacher		<input type="checkbox"/>
BARBARA BOXER , Democratic U.S. Senator		<input type="checkbox"/>
BILL JONES , Republican Farmer / Businessman		<input type="checkbox"/>
DON J. GRUNDMANN , American Independent Doctor of Chiropractic		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE		
44th Congressional District		Vote for One
KEN CALVERT , Republican Member of Congress		<input type="checkbox"/>
KEVIN AKIN , Peace and Freedom Supervising Stationary Engineer		<input type="checkbox"/>
LOUIS VANDENBERG , Democratic College Administrator		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

33-A001

TURN CARD OVER**A****A**

I HAVE VOTED—HAVE YOU?

STATE SENATOR		
31st Senatorial District		Vote for One
MARJORIE MUSSER MIKELS , Democratic Constitutional Attorney / Businessowner		<input type="checkbox"/>
BOB DUTTON , Republican Member of California Legislature / Business Owner		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY		
63rd Assembly District		Vote for One
D'ANDRE MCNAMEE , Democratic Small Business Owner		<input type="checkbox"/>
MAUREEN K. KEEDY , Libertarian Educator		<input type="checkbox"/>
BILL EMMERSON , Republican Businessman / Educator / Doctor		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>

33-A002

TURN CARD OVER**A****Sample Ballot****Sample Ballot**

B**OFFICIAL BALLOT**

Consolidated General Election

Riverside County

November 2, 2004

This ballot stub shall be removed and retained by the voter.

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
STATE	
1A	PROTECTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVENUES Ensures local property tax and sales tax revenues remain with local government thereby safeguarding funding for public safety, health, libraries, parks, and other local services. Provisions can only be suspended if the Governor declares a fiscal necessity and two-thirds of the Legislature concur. Fiscal Impact: Higher local government revenues than otherwise would have been the case, possibly in the billions of dollars annually over time. Any such local revenue impacts would result in decreased resources to the state of similar amounts.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
59	PUBLIC RECORDS, OPEN MEETINGS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Amends Constitution to include public's right of access to meetings of government bodies and writings of government officials. Preserves specified constitutional rights; retains existing exclusions for certain meetings and records. Fiscal Impact: Potential minor annual state and local government costs to make additional information available to the public.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
60	ELECTION RIGHTS OF POLITICAL PARTIES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Requires general election ballot include candidate receiving most votes among candidates of same party for partisan office in primary election. Fiscal Impact: No fiscal effect.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
60 A	SURPLUS PROPERTY. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Sale proceeds of most surplus state property pay off specified bonds. Fiscal Impact: Net savings over the longer term-potentially low tens of millions of dollars-from accelerated repayment of existing bonds.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
61	CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL PROJECTS. GRANT PROGRAM. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes \$750 million general obligation bonds for grants to eligible children's hospitals for construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation, furnishing and equipping children's hospitals. Fiscal Impact: State cost of about \$1.5 billion over 30 years to pay off both the principal (\$750 million) and interest (\$756 million) costs of the bonds. Payments of about \$50 million per year.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

33-B003

TURN CARD OVER**B****B**

I HAVE VOTED—HAVE YOU?

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
STATE	
62	ELECTIONS. PRIMARIES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Requires primary elections where voters may vote for any state or federal candidate regardless of party registration of voter or candidate. The two primary-election candidates receiving most votes for an office, whether they are candidates with "no party" or members of same or different party, would be listed on general election ballot. Exempts presidential nominations. Fiscal Impact: No significant net fiscal effect on state and local governments.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
63	MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES EXPANSION, FUNDING. TAX ON PERSONAL INCOMES ABOVE \$1 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Establishes 1% tax on taxable personal income above \$1 million to fund expanded health services for mentally ill children, adults, seniors. Fiscal Impact: Additional state revenues of about \$800 million annually by 2006-07, with comparable annual increases in total state and county expenditures for expansion of mental health programs. Unknown partially offsetting savings to state and local agencies.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
64	LIMITS ON PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF UNFAIR BUSINESS COMPETITION LAWS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allows individual or class action "unfair business" lawsuits only if actual loss suffered; only government officials may enforce these laws on public's behalf. Fiscal Impact: Unknown state fiscal impact depending on whether the measure increases or decreases court workload and the extent to which diverted funds are replaced. Unknown potential costs to local governments, depending on the extent to which diverted funds are replaced.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
65	LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNDS, REVENUES. STATE MANDATES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Requires voter approval for reduction of local fee/tax revenues. Permits suspension of state mandate if no state reimbursement to local government within 180 days after obligation determined. Fiscal Impact: Higher local government revenues than otherwise would have been the case, possibly in the billions of dollars annually over time. Any such local revenue impacts would result in decreased resources to the state of similar amounts.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

33-B004

TURN CARD OVER**B****Sample Ballot****Sample Ballot**

C

OFFICIAL BALLOT
Consolidated General Election
Riverside County
November 2, 2004

This ballot stub shall be removed and retained by the voter.

Sample Ballot

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
STATE	
66	LIMITATIONS ON "THREE STRIKES" LAW. SEX CRIMES. PUNISHMENT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Limits "Three Strikes" law to violent and/or serious felonies. Permits limited resentencing under new definitions. Increases punishment for specified sex crimes against children. Fiscal Impact: Over the long run, net state savings of up to several hundred million dollars annually, primarily to the prison system; local jail and court-related costs of potentially more than ten million dollars annually.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
67	EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES. FUNDING. TELEPHONE SURCHARGE. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Increases telephone surcharge and allocates other funds for emergency room physicians, hospital emergency rooms, community clinics, emergency personnel training/equipment, and 911 telephone system. Fiscal Impact: Increased state revenues of about \$500 million annually to reimburse physicians and hospitals for uncompensated emergency medical services and other specified purposes. Continues \$32 million in state funding for physicians and clinics for uncompensated medical care.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
68	NON-TRIBAL COMMERCIAL GAMBLING EXPANSION. TRIBAL GAMING COMPACT AMENDMENTS. REVENUES, TAX EXEMPTIONS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Authorizes tribal compact amendments. Unless tribes accept, authorizes casino gaming for sixteen non-tribal establishments. Percentage of gaming revenues fund government services. Fiscal Impact: Increased gambling revenues-potentially over \$1 billion annually-primarily to local governments for additional specified services. Depending on outcome of tribal negotiations, potential loss of state revenues totaling hundreds of millions of dollars annually.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
69	DNA SAMPLES. COLLECTION. DATABASE. FUNDING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Requires collection of DNA samples from all felons, and from others arrested for or charged with specified crimes, and submission to state DNA database. Provides for funding. Fiscal Impact: Net state cost to process DNA samples of potentially nearly \$20 million annually when costs are fully realized. Local costs likely more than fully offset by revenues, with the additional revenues available for other DNA-related activities.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

33-C005

TURN CARD OVER

C

C

I HAVE VOTED—HAVE YOU?

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
STATE	
70	TRIBAL GAMING COMPACTS. EXCLUSIVE GAMING RIGHTS. CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Upon tribe's request, Governor must execute 99-year compact. Tribes contribute percentage of net gaming income to state funds, in exchange for expanded, exclusive tribal casino gaming. Fiscal Impact: Unknown effect on payments to the state from Indian tribes. The potential increase or decrease in these payments could be in the tens of millions to over a hundred million dollars annually.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
71	STEM CELL RESEARCH. FUNDING. BONDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. This measure establishes "California Institute for Regenerative Medicine" to regulate and fund stem cell research, constitutional right to conduct such research, and oversight committee. Prohibits funding of human reproductive cloning research. Fiscal Impact: State cost of about \$6 billion over 30 years to pay off both the principal (\$3 billion) and interest (\$3 billion) on the bonds. State payments averaging about \$200 million per year.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
72	HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM. A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects legislation requiring health care coverage for employees, as specified, working for large and medium employers. Fiscal Impact: Significant expenditures fully offset, mainly by employer fees, for a state program primarily to purchase private health insurance coverage. Significant county health program savings. Significant public employer health coverage costs. Significant net state revenue losses. Overall unknown net state and local savings or costs.
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
JUDICIAL	
Judge of the Superior Court Office #7 Vote for One	
SHAFFER T. CORMELL Attorney Criminal Civil <input type="checkbox"/>	
SARAH ADAMS CHRISTIAN Deputy District Attorney <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	

33-C006

TURN CARD OVER

C

Sample Ballot

D

OFFICIAL BALLOT
 Consolidated General Election
Riverside County
 November 2, 2004

This ballot stub shall be removed and retained by the voter.

Sample Ballot

SCHOOL	
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	
Governing Board Member Vote for no more than Two	
JIM REAL Retired Businessman	<input type="checkbox"/>
JANET MARY GREEN Administrator / Business Professor	<input type="checkbox"/>
MIKE GASCA College Student / Businessman	<input type="checkbox"/>
MARY FIGUEROA Incumbent	<input type="checkbox"/>
ALBERTO "BETO" CAMARENA Educator	<input type="checkbox"/>
GLORIA WILLIS Retired Teacher / Homemaker	<input type="checkbox"/>
MARK A. TAKANO Incumbent	<input type="checkbox"/>
ANDREW "BEN" AAMES Attorney	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
CITY	
CITY OF RIVERSIDE	
BB Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended by amending the Preamble to better reflect the diversity and inclusiveness of Riverside, changing the title of Article II, and correcting typographical errors in sections 1110 and 1111?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
CC Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to (1) add a new Section 201, entitled "Access to public meetings and public records;" (2) provide that meetings of ad hoc Council committees and Mayoral-appointed bodies be open to the public; (3) all closed session meetings of the City Council be audiorecorded; and (4) provide that the City Clerk shall help members of the public examine and copy all public records?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>

33-D007

TURN CARD OVER**D****D**

I HAVE VOTED—HAVE YOU?

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
CITY	
CITY OF RIVERSIDE	
DD Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended by adding a new Section 202, entitled "Adoption of ethics code," which would require the City of Riverside to adopt within six months a Code of Ethics and Conduct?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
EE Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to (1) provide that the City Council review the compensation of the Mayor and City Council every two years and that any increase be limited to five percent every two years; and (2) eliminate the Mayor and Council members salary commission?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
FF Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to provide that the Mayor shall appoint the chairperson to all City Council standing committees?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
GG Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to provide that each City board or commission shall have at least one member from each Council Ward?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
HH Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to provide that minors may be appointed to City boards or commissions with preferential voting privileges only or to a youth commission?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
II Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to add a new section 810, which would add the Community Police Review Commission to the Charter?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
JJ Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to allow the City Council (1) to conduct an election for a bonded indebtedness by a mail-ballot election; and (2) to sell such bonds, notes or other evidences of indebtedness at public sale by notice inviting bids or by negotiated private sale?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>

33-D008

TURN CARD OVER**D**

Sample Ballot

Sample Ballot

Sample Ballot

E

OFFICIAL BALLOT
Consolidated General Election
Riverside County
November 2, 2004

I HAVE VOTED—HAVE YOU?

This ballot stub shall be removed and retained by the voter.

MEASURE(S) SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS	
CITY	
CITY OF RIVERSIDE	
KK Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to (1) provide that bids on public works contracts can be accompanied by such other form of bidder's security as the City Council establishes by ordinance; and (2) add a new Section 1114, entitled "Use of design-build procurement for public works projects," which would permit the award of contracts for the combined design and construction of public works projects?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
LL Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to provide that the City change its independent auditor at least every five years?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
MM Shall the Charter of the City of Riverside be amended to (1) allow the board of public utilities to award and execute contracts for construction, goods or services for the public utility; (2) allow the director of public utilities to approve work to be done at the customers' request and expense; and (3) allow the director of public utilities to negotiate and execute contracts with individual retail customers for utility services?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>

This page was intentionally left blank.
Examine both sides of each card for voting opportunities.

33-E009

TURN CARD OVER

E

39-N999

N

VOTER'S PAMPHLET INFORMATION SECTION

The Following Pages Contain
Voter Information Applicable to your Ballot
Which May Include Any/All of the Following Items:

- CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS
- BALLOT MEASURES
- ANALYSES
- ARGUMENTS PRO & CON
- TEXT OF MEASURE(S)

This pamphlet section may not contain a complete list of candidates. A complete list of candidates appears on the Sample Ballot. 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.

Arguments in support of or in opposition to the proposed laws 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. This is a result of Proposition 34 adopted by the voters at the November 2000 General Election, and of a new statute passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in 2001. 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, 31ST DISTRICT

Bob Dutton, Republican
Marjorie Musser Mikels, Democratic

STATE SENATE, 37TH DISTRICT

Pat Johansen, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 63RD DISTRICT

Maureen K. Keedy, Libertarian
D'Andre McNamee, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 64TH DISTRICT

John J. Benoit, Republican
Robert Melsh, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 65TH DISTRICT

Russ Bogh, Republican
Rita Ramirez-Dean, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 66TH DISTRICT

Jack N. Lee, Libertarian
Laurel Nicholson, Democratic

STATE ASSEMBLY, 71ST DISTRICT

Bea Foster, Democratic
Todd Spitzer, Republican

STATE ASSEMBLY, 80TH DISTRICT

STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES SEEKING PARTISAN OFFICE

CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR STATE SENATOR, 31ST DISTRICT

MARJORIE MUSSER MIKELS AGE: 58
OCCUPATION: Constitutional Attorney/Small Business Owner
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

As your State Senator I pledge to work for: a robust and just economy; educational excellence for all; affordable health care; sustainable, affordable energy; clean and healthful environment

Support small business and working families: As a small business owner, I will vote to ease tax burdens on small business and working people. I want global corporations profiting from California's marketplace to pay a fair share of taxes. Profiteers, like Enron, who caused unprecedented deficits by gouging California energy consumers, must repay ill-gotten gains. I will vote to reduce borrowing, which straps future generations with debt.

Protect our natural resources: I waged successful political and legal battles against the Ward Valley nuclear dump that threatened our water with radioactive waste. As Senator, I will work to save our local forests from drought, fire, bark beetle infestation and over-development. Federal dollars must be used to clean up local groundwater basins, polluted by federal contractors. I oppose privatization of water resources.

Uphold freedom/justice: A UCLA-trained attorney, I've fought utility taxes and property assessments that penalize homeowners, seniors and the poor. We can save billions by amending "Three Strikes" to target only violent crimes and use the savings to build schools and colleges, not more prisons. Educate rather than incarcerate. Proudly progressive, I'm a mother who supports less governmental intrusion into our private lives.

I need your vote to help roll back right wing extremism and good-old-boy cronyism.

Elect Marjorie Mikels! "A vision of hope, the courage for change "

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, OFFICE #7**

SHAFFER T. CORMELL

AGE: 42

**OCCUPATION: Attorney Criminal Civil
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:**

I am the only candidate with experience as Judge Pro-Tem. In over 13 years as a Riverside County attorney, I have dealt with a wide range of criminal and civil cases. I have been an Adjunct Professor of Business Law and am active in church and community leadership. My wife, Melissa and I have two children.

As your Judge, I pledge to act with integrity, be firm, fair, and uphold the United States and California Constitutions. I will work hard to protect our neighborhoods from violent crime. I will diligently seek innovative and successful ways of continuing my fight against the scourge of illegal drugs, so devastating to all sectors of our society.

Shaffer Cormell's endorsements include:

Superior Court Judges: Dallas Holmes; Richard Fields; Christopher Sheldon; Graham Anderson Cribbs. Judicial Officers: Ronald Lorden; Thomas Hudspeth.

Riverside County Board of Supervisors: Roy Wilson; Marion Ashley; Bob Buster; John Tavaglione. Law Enforcement: Retired Sheriff of Riverside County, Cois Byrd; Chief Robert Grady, Retired; Lieutenant Tim Wade. Mayors: Ron Loveridge; Brian DeForge; Daryl Busch, Art Welch. Retired State Senators: Dave Kelley; Robert Presley

Vote for Shaffer Cormell for safer communities and a better future. For more information and many more endorsements: www.shaffercormell.com; 760-922-9223

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, OFFICE #7**

SARAH A. CHRISTIAN

AGE: 57

**OCCUPATION: Deputy District Attorney
EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:**

I am: The only law enforcement candidate on the ballot. Committed to the public safety of our citizens. Committed to being tough on crime while applying the law fairly and impartially to everyone. Known to be fair, firm, hard working.

I will: Remain supportive of law enforcement personnel and goals. Work to maintain efficient administration of court operations. Bring maturity, integrity, honesty, sound reasoning and knowledge of the law to my performance of the duties of judge.

Experience: Attorney 14 years. Deputy District Attorney 2 years. Juvenile Special Prosecutor 5 years. General civil practice of law 10 years.

Education: California Baptist University, Bachelor of Arts, Business Administration, California Baptist University, Bachelor of Sciences, Political Science, University of LaVerne College of Law, Juris Doctor.

My website at <http://electchristianjudge.org> will tell you more about me, my background, and how I think. I hope you will take the time to read it. You may write me at Sarah@electchristianjudge.org if you have specific questions. Thank you for your support.

Endorsements include: District Attorney Grover Trask, Sheriff Bob Doyle, Hon. Jean Leonard, Riverside Sheriffs' Assoc., Riverside County Deputy District Attorneys' Assoc., Rod Pacheco, Assistant District Attorney, Marion Ashley, 5th District Supervisor

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER,
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

JANET GREEN

OCCUPATION: Administrator, Business Professor

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

My goal as a Board member will be to provide the finest occupational and general education opportunities for our students, so they can upgrade their income and job status for the benefit of the entire community.

Educational quality, counseling, registration, scholarships, athletics, and programs for students should be the highest district priorities.

Unfortunately, current district priorities are not where they should be. Money has been spent on administrators traveling to Europe and lawsuits against those who question current spending practices.

The La Sierra property purchased by the district, now sitting idle, should be used or sold, alleviating the burden on taxpayers.

I want proper planning and good fiscal management. Decisions should be made to benefit students, not bureaucrats.

For 26 years, I served as a faculty member, dean and Health Services Director at a local community college. I know how the system works. I will get results.

Currently, I serve on many state and local boards and commissions, including the State Bar Board of Governors and the Fair Housing, Sexual Assault, Child Support, and Inland Agency Boards. I am an RN and an Air Force veteran. I have a BA from Redlands University and an MA from CSU.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER,
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

MARY FIGUEROA

AGE: 48

OCCUPATION: Peace Officer/Correctional Counselor

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS

It has been my privilege to lead RCC as Board President during the most dynamic period in its history. The voters approved Measure C to meet the needs our growth required. I will ensure that this money will strengthen the academic and vocational opportunities of the college.

As a Riverside native, graduate of North High and UC Riverside, I know the importance of a quality education. Through my work as a Correctional Counselor, I witness daily what happens to individuals with a lack of educational opportunity.

Since 1995, my priorities as a trustee have been fiscal responsibility, student access, and independent status for each of the campuses. We have opened phase two on the Norco and Moreno Valley campuses, and the new Digital Library at Riverside has provided the community access to state of the art information technology.

I will continue to ensure that standards for a quality education are met. Individuals with the desire to learn will find an accessible educational institution, a college faculty second to none and a student population reflecting the diversity of the community it represents.

Please vote for me so that I may continue to work for our students and their future.

**CANDIDATE STATEMENT FOR
GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER,
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

MARK A. TAKANO

AGE: 43

OCCUPATION: Community College Trustee - High School Teacher

EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS:

Harvard College, BA in Government, 1983; UC Riverside, School of Education. RCC Trustee, 14 years; Member, Board of Directors of California Community College Trustees, 8 years.

Thanks to you, the voters, \$350 million in capital construction bonds were approved last March. I appreciate your confidence in RCC's fiscal management and educational leadership. Because of your vision, future students will continue to have access to the best educational opportunities. I pledge that your tax dollars will be used wisely to build classrooms and laboratories to meet the needs of future growth.

Through intensive, bipartisan federal and state legislative advocacy, RCC has secured significant new money for operations: equalization funding, state and federal grants. This means more full-time faculty for all the classrooms we will build and high quality programs. Our legislative advocacy has been effective. I pledge to improve and continue this work to secure more funding in the future.

The Norco and Moreno Valley campuses will soon emerge as independent colleges. RCC is in transition to a three-college system. RCC faces complex management challenges ahead. Now, more than ever, sound and experienced leadership is needed.

I stand on fourteen years of successful service. I ask for your support again. www.marktakano.com

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "BB"

(Preamble, Title of Article II, Typographical Errors)

This measure contains three proposed amendments to the City of Riverside Charter.

The first proposed amendment pertains to the preamble to the Charter. Current law provides a short statement as a preamble, reflecting the City's right to enact a charter. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would add the following statement to the Preamble:

"We, the people of the City of Riverside believe in promoting an inclusive community with shared economic, environmental and cultural prosperity, equal civil and political rights, social harmony and cohesion, and opportunities for all governed by responsible and responsive public officials who promote citizen participation, as well as just and equitable tax and financial policies; and these beliefs are rooted in our desire to enhance the uniqueness of the City of Riverside."

The second proposed amendment, if passed by a majority of voters, would change the title of Article II from "Powers of the City" to "General Powers of the City."

The third proposed amendment, if passed by a majority of voters, would correct certain typographical errors in the text of the Charter.

None of these proposed amendments impose any obligations or duties on the City.

If Measure "BB" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "BB." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "BB"

The Charter Review Committee voted unanimously to amend the Preamble, change the title of Article II, and correct the typographical errors in sections 1110 and 1111. The most significant change a yes on Measure "BB" would bring about is an amendment to the Preamble that enhances it from simply identifying the source of authority and action statement to include a section on the intent of the residents of Riverside; a more subjective declaration reflecting goals, diversity, responsiveness, governing values and civic participation. The purpose of this addition is to exemplify the fundamental principles that reflect the spirit of the City of Riverside. Vote yes on Measure "BB."

By: Eric Haley
Charter Review Committee Member

Connie Howard Leach

William R. Bailey, III

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "BB"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "CC"

(Access to Public Meetings and Records, Audio Record of Closed Sessions, Citizen Participation at Meetings of Ad Hoc Committees, City Clerk Assist Public in Accessing Public Records)

This measure contains four proposed amendments to the City of Riverside Charter.

The first proposed amendment would add a new section to the Charter entitled "Access to public meetings and public records." Current law requires meetings of legislative bodies of local public agencies to be open and public. Such legislative bodies include the City Council, and any commission, committee, board or other body created by the City Council except for "ad hoc" committees or bodies created by the Mayor. An "ad hoc" committee is generally considered to be an advisory body composed solely of less than a quorum, or majority, of the legislative body. An ad hoc committee is one that will serve a limited or single purpose, is not perpetual, and is to be dissolved once their specific task is completed. An example would be an advisory committee composed of less than a quorum created to advise City staff on a single, narrow issue of importance to the City. Current law does not require the City to make meetings of "ad hoc" committees created by the City Council or other bodies created by the Mayor open and public. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would codify such existing California law in the Charter, and would also provide that all ad hoc committees created by the City Council or other bodies created by the Mayor are subject to such laws.

The second proposed amendment pertains to closed session meetings of the City Council. Current law provides that "closed sessions" are meetings conducted in private without the attendance of the public or the media. Such meetings are permitted only for specified purposes. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would require the City to audio-record all such closed session meetings, retain such recordings for at least two years, and keep such recordings confidential.

The third proposed amendment pertains to the right of citizens to make comments at meetings of ad hoc City Council committees. Current law provides that citizens may publicly comment at regular meetings of the City Council or City Council standing committees. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow citizens to make public comments at any meeting of an ad hoc City Council committee.

The fourth proposed amendment pertains to the City of Riverside City Clerk's obligation under California law to assist the public in examining and copying public records. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would codify existing California law in the Charter.

If Measure "CC" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "CC." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "CC"

The City of Riverside should make every effort to open up its decision making process and make it easy for its citizens to access public documents. Furthermore, to maintain full public confidence in the propriety of the actions of the Mayor and City Council, all closed sessions should be audio recorded, as permitted by State law, consistent with the strict privacy protections guaranteed in State statutes.

Full public access and participation in government should include knowledge of, and participation in, all the deliberations of the policy making bodies of local government. Over the years Riverside's population has grown and the City Council's obligations have expanded. As the complexity of city issues has increased, the use of ad-hoc sub-committees, consisting of fewer than a majority of the Council, has become an important and frequently used tool to develop policy recommendations to the full City Council. Even though these ad-hoc committees are temporary and not covered by open-meeting laws, they can play a decisive role in crafting the final actions of the Mayor and City Council.

Because of the importance of ad-hoc committees and because of the City of Riverside's commitment to open government and citizen participation, the seventeen members of the Riverside Charter Review Committee unanimously recommend a yes vote on Charter Measure "CC."

By: The Riverside Charter Review Committee

Eric Haley, Charter Review Committee Member

Marcia McQuern

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "CC"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "DD"

(Code of Ethics)

Current law does not require the City of Riverside to have a code of ethics for its elected officials and members of appointed boards, commissions and committees.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would require the City Council to adopt a code of ethics within six months of the effective date of this Charter amendment. The nature and scope of the code of ethics would be determined by the City Council. The code of ethics would apply to the Mayor, members of the City Council, and members of the City's boards and commissions.

If Measure "DD" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "DD." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "DD"

To insure public trust and confidence in elected officials and decision-makers, many cities have adopted a code of ethics affirming that decisions will be made impartially and with accountability to the public. Experience has shown that a code of ethics promotes a City Hall culture that values communication, collaboration, service-orientation, and positive attitudes in interpersonal relations in the workforce and with the community.

The purpose of a code of ethics in the City Charter is to provide the community with knowledge that its elected officials, other decision-makers, and public representatives serving on City boards and commissions commit to service in the community based on ethics, honesty and integrity.

By: Dr. Damon Castillo, Jr

Rose M. Mayes

Ben Johnson, II

Art Garcia

Eric Haley

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "DD"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "EE"

(Mayor and City Councilmembers Salary)

Current law provides for a Mayor and City Council member salary commission. Such commission is required to meet in every even-numbered year to make recommendations to the City Council concerning the compensation of the Mayor and City Council members. Compensation for the Mayor and City Council members is then set by ordinance after a duly noticed public hearing. Any such ordinance must be approved by at least five affirmative votes of the City Council. Current law does not limit the amount of such increase.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would eliminate the Mayor and City Council member salary commission, and require the City Council, in January of every odd-numbered year, to review the compensation of the Mayor and City Council members. The City Council, in establishing any increase to such compensation, would be limited to a five percent increase from their then-existing salary. Such increase would still have to be adopted by ordinance by no fewer than five affirmative votes.

If Measure "EE" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "EE." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "EE"

In order to avoid the debacle of 2002, we need to change the city's system for determining mayoral and City Council compensation. That year's council totally rejected the advice of the charter-required citizens Salary Commission which, after spending months studying the issue, determined that council members deserved no raises for what commissioners said was part-time public service. Council members responded by voting themselves 60 percent increases, an action that was widely criticized.

The current Charter Review Committee concluded that the charter should eliminate the Salary Commission, as several commissioners suggested, and accept the current level of council and mayor salaries. It also decided the charter should remain silent on the full-time versus part-time issue, leaving it to ward voters to decide if their representative was working long enough hours.

While elected officials understandably would rather not take the heat for raising their pay themselves, the charter committee rejected automatic raises tied to judges' salaries, the increases the council gives City employees or a cost of living index. Instead, this measure allows, but does not require, the Council to raise members' salaries no more than 5 percent every two years with at least a five-of-seven affirmative vote.

The committee believes that council members should take responsibility for their compensation increases. In years of budget cuts and giving City employees no or small raises, they are unlikely to give themselves big raises, if any.

By: Marcia McQuern

Eric Haley

Ben Johnson, II

Rose M. Mayes

Dorothy Bailey

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "EE"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "FF"

(Mayoral Appointment of Chairpersons to City Council Standing Committees)

The City Council currently has eight "standing" committees. A "standing committee" is an advisory committee composed of less than a quorum, or majority, of the City Council members. These committees are organized by subject matter (e.g., Development Committee, Finance Committee, Public Safety Committee, etc.) and meet regularly to discuss issues referred by the City Council. The policy and practice of the City Council has been that, by majority vote, the City Council appoints one chairperson, one vice chairperson and one member to such a committee.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow the Mayor, instead of the City Council, to appoint the chairperson to each such standing committee. The City Council would still appoint the vice chairperson and the other member to the standing committee, by majority vote.

If Measure "FF" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "FF." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "FF"

Unlike City Council members, the Mayor is the only governing official elected by residents citywide. One of the principal powers and duties assigned to the Mayor is to offer guidance on policy matters by setting goals for City Council members and by promoting support for those policies that address the most significant municipal issues from a citywide standpoint.

A yes vote on Measure "FF" will expand the powers and duties of the Mayor to include the right to appoint the chairs of the City Council standing committees. The current selection process for chair appointment allows council members to choose the committee they wish to chair based on council member seniority. Amending the City Charter to authorize the Mayor to appoint the chairs of the City Council standing committees will add perspective and objectivity to the selection process and will uphold the citywide viewpoint rather than any perceived ward-influenced agenda. Further, changing the City Charter to allow the Mayor to appoint these important chair positions to City Council standing committees will ensure a level of accountability essential for balanced and successful municipal government for the City of Riverside. Vote yes on Measure "FF."

By: Connie Howard Leach

Eric Haley
Charter Review Committee Member

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "FF"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "GG"

(Ward Representation on City Boards and Commissions)

Current law provides that members of City boards and commissions shall be comprised of qualified electors of the City, none of whom shall hold any paid office or employment in City government. Such boards and commissions serve as advisory bodies to the City Council. Currently, there are thirteen boards and commissions.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would require that each such board or commission have at least one member from each City Council ward. Such members would still have to be qualified electors and not hold any such paid office or employment in City government. If approved, the City Council would have to review the then current membership of each board and commission to determine whether or not there is representation from each City Council ward. Current board and commission members may be subject to removal from office in order to comply with this measure. For example, if a seven member board or commission currently has members who reside in only five of the City's seven council wards, then two of the members who reside in the over-represented wards would be removed from office. They would be replaced by two new members who reside in each of the two previously unrepresented council wards.

If Measure "GG" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "GG." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "GG"

The basic principle of representative democracy is public participation in local governance. In support of this concept, boards and commissions were established by City Charter to allow the public to provide advice and input to the City Council in their decision-making process. However, the current process is not providing adequate representation across all wards. Data has confirmed that 60% of the membership of all City boards and commissions comes from one ward, while some other wards have little or no representation.

Amending the City Charter to provide each board or commission with a member from each Council ward will ensure that each ward will have input in the decisions affecting all members of the community.

This amendment does not change the selection process of members of boards and commissions; it simply requires representation from all areas of the City. The entire City Council and Mayor are involved in the process, ensuring that there are quality representatives with diverse backgrounds and experiences serving on boards and commissions. The Council and Mayor will still be able to name at-large members, in addition to the newly required ward representatives. Current board and commission members could continue with the addition of representatives from the previously unrepresented wards.

The City of Riverside is proud of its diversity. By amending the City Charter to require representation from each Council ward, we ensure that our diversity is not only acknowledged, but also respected.

By: Barry C. Johnson

Dorothy Bailey

Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

Dr. Damon Castillo, Jr.

Mike Teer

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "GG"

It is simply not true that 60 percent of the membership of all City boards and commissions come from one ward. The ward with the most representation has about 37 percent of the board/commission membership and every ward is represented on at least five boards or commissions.

The reason for the under-representation of some wards on boards and commissions is not discrimination, but rather a shortage of applications from people in some areas of the city with the interest, time and experience to serve. More aggressive outreach for applications can address this issue without risking the forced appointment of less qualified people than now serve. All wards' interests are protected because the City Council, where every ward has equal representation, is the final authority on all city issues.

By: Marcia McQuern

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "GG"

While it superficially may sound like a good idea to require mandatory ward representation on all city boards and commissions, after much discussion and reflection a majority of the Charter Review Committee came to understand that the current appointment system is superior to this measure. However, the supermajority of two thirds required to withdraw the initial recommendation was not achieved.

The major problem with creating a requirement that each ward be represented on every board and commission is that it would promote ward-centered decisions rather than a focus on what is best for the whole city. The requirement would be particularly detrimental to boards and commissions that benefit from members with specialized knowledge, such as the Police Review Commission and the Public Utilities Board.

Further, approval of Measure "GG" would require the immediate removal of many excellent appointees now serving. This would leave city boards and commissions with sudden vacancies that would be filled by reference to geographic residency rather than by consideration of experience, qualifications and community commitment.

Currently, the mayor and council collaborate on appointments, seeking not only diversity in ward residency, but also in community involvement, work experience, ethnicity and gender. While a screening committee selects among applicants for interviews, any council member can require that any applicant be interviewed. It takes five votes to appoint a board or commission member. A mandatory ward requirement could lead to patronage appointments rather than appointments made through the current deliberative process.

Although too often there are few applicants from one or more of the wards, we do not need to change the City Charter to get broader ward representation. We can improve outreach efforts by council members and city staff encouraging qualified residents in all parts of the city to become involved.

Vote no on "GG."

By: Marcia McQuern

NO REBUTTAL FILED TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "GG"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "HH"

(Youth Members on City Boards and Commissions)

Current law provides that members of City boards and commissions shall be comprised of qualified electors of the City, none of whom shall hold any paid office or employment in City government. Current law defines an "elector" as any person who is a United States citizen, 18 years of age or older, and a resident of the City at least 15 days prior to an election.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow minors to be appointed to either a youth commission or other boards or commissions, so long as they otherwise legally qualify as electors. Except for minors appointed to a youth commission, a minor appointed to a board or commission would serve as a preferential voting member. This means that the minor's vote would be advisory only and would not be part of the official vote on a matter. Such minor's appointment would not be counted against the number of members established by ordinance of the City Council for that board or commission. Also, the minor would not be allowed to attend closed session meetings of a board or commission, or vote on any such matters subject to closed session discussion.

If Measure "HH" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "HH." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "HH"

Offering minors the opportunity to hold a seat on City boards and commissions as preferential voters will give the youth in Riverside a voice in shaping their community and a practical lesson in the operations of city government. A preferential vote is not a vote that will affect any action taken by the board or commission, but rather it is a vote that is only reflected in the minutes of the meeting to ensure that the youth member's opinion is recorded. A yes vote on Measure "HH" will not take a seat away from an adult on any City board or commission. The youth member will be an additional member to the currently established number of members.

Amending the City Charter to allow minors to participate on City boards and commissions will teach the youth of Riverside how to meet community challenges, make hard decisions, and develop civic responsibility. Adults and young people working together on City boards and commissions will build stronger adult youth relationships and change the culture to view youth as resources rather than merely recipients of what adults have to give.

The youth of Riverside are the leaders of tomorrow. Young people involved in city government are better prepared to be leaders and decision makers in all aspects of their lives. The opportunity for youth to serve on boards and commissions will add a fresh perspective and a diversity of opinion to issues that relate to the quality of life in the community. Everyone benefits with a yes vote on Measure "HH."

By: Connie Howard Leach

Eric Haley, Charter Review Committee Member

William R. Bailey, III

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "HH"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "II"

(Community Police Review Commission)

The current City Charter does not include the City's Community Police Review Commission as one of the enumerated City boards and commissions. The Community Police Review Commission was created by ordinance of the City Council in April of 2000.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would add the Community Police Review Commission to the Charter, with the same powers and duties as already established by ordinance of the City Council. Such powers and duties would include the following:

(a) advise the Mayor and City Council on all police/community relations issues; (b) public outreach to educate the community on the purpose of the commission; (c) receipt and discretionary review and investigation of citizen complaints against officers of the Riverside Police Department filed within six months of the date of the alleged misconduct; (d) review and investigate the death of any individual arising out of or in connection with actions of a police officer; (e) conduct a hearing on filed complaints or commission-initiated investigations when such hearing, in the discretion of the commission, will facilitate the fact finding process; (f) require the attendance of witnesses, through subpoena, and the production of books and papers at commission investigations; (g) make findings concerning allegations contained in the filed complaint; (h) advise the Riverside Police Department in matters pertaining to police policies and practices; and (i) prepare an annual report to the Mayor and City Council on commission activities.

If Measure "II" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City. This measure would not impact the City Council's current obligations under Section 801 of the City Charter. Section 801 provides that the City Council shall budget funds which in its opinion are sufficient for the efficient and proper functioning of City boards and commissions.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "II." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "II"

Riverside has developed a civil forum to resolve disputes between Riverside's many diverse communities and our police department. The Community Police Review Commission's independent and objective status lets the community be confident that police problems are not ignored and that false accusations of officers do not stand. In the Commission's four years, 98% of citizen complaints reviewed supported the actions of the police officer. Those findings support police officers in the difficult work they do every day. In the other 2% the Commission identified problems that can be resolved with feedback or retraining. This process supports valid claims against the officer and reaffirms our faith in the Riverside Police Department.

Continuing police review and accountability is simply good government. Since the Commission was established in April of 2000, through the submission of this argument in August 2004, the city has settled two (2) lawsuits alleging police abuse of force for a combined total of \$51,500. Police review helps save money paid in lawsuits through a community grievance procedure that can be trusted. Additional key contributions include Chief Leach's leadership and increased officer training.

Placing the Commission in the charter will permit it to do its work in a less politically volatile climate. Previous efforts to de-fund and change the makeup of the Commission are clear evidence that the Commission must be placed in a more independent, unbiased position within our city structure.

The Commission has provided important recommendations for change in police policy and procedures that help establish a better working relationship between the department and the community it serves.

Protect effective, unbiased accountability in Riverside, our "All America City" and restore public confidence. Vote "YES" to add the Commission to the City Charter.

By: Art Garcia

Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

Rose M. Mayes

William R. Bailey, III

Dr. Damon Castillo, Jr.

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "II"

Measure "II" amounts to wasteful spending. The Community Police Review Commission (CPRC) is the only city board or commission that carries a \$300,000 budget and is the only board or commission that is funded independently from the rest of the city budget. The entire cost of running the commission has been estimated at around \$600,000 whereas, most of the City boards and commissions have a budget of a few thousand dollars.

Measure "II" does not offer our city government the flexibility to modify or change the commission as the city grows. Our city council needs to have the flexibility to modify, change, or remove the commission to reflect what our community wants. The CPRC is, and should remain, an administrative function and not a product of the city constitution. If measure II is passed, it will take another charter amendment to modify or remove the commission. An undue burden we do not want to bear.

Our current system has worked very well for years and the old adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" still holds true. The commission doesn't work and it creates an unnecessary financial burden to our city. The Police Department already has many levels of oversight including the Riverside County District Attorney's Office, State Attorney General's Office, California Department of Justice, United States Department of Justice, United States Attorney General's Office, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). CPRC is not capable of conducting investigations to the level and skill of the aforementioned investigative bureau's and departments.

Our Police Officers work very hard to provide the excellent level of service we should expect from our fine city. Support our Police Officers, and trust our City Council to make the correct decisions for us. Vote 'No' on measure "II."

By: Christian Dinco,
Riverside Police Officer's Association

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "II"

CPRC advises the Mayor and City Council on all police/community issues. It has been an essential element for Community Oriented Policing. The flexibility for change to meet the needs of the community is still in the hands of the City Council via the ordinance process.

Opponents of Measure "II" suggest that other law enforcement agencies provide police oversight. These agencies are not established to conduct citizen complaints on a day-to-day basis, nor do they have authority on such issues of local control. Most complaints are deemed to be unfounded, exonerated, or not sustained.

CPRC makes an effort to maintain a balance between the privacy rights of police officers and the public's right to register complaints. Fact-finding processes provide procedural due process for officers; however, CPRC has no role in the disciplinary process.

Opponents of Measure "II" offer CPRC costs not supported by facts. Actual expenditures have never exceeded the amount budgeted in the General Fund. The FY 2002-03 budget was about one half of one percent of the Police Department's budget. Proposed budget for FY 2004-05 is approximately \$6,400 greater than the FY 2003-04 budget.

Citizen input into the decision-making process is a fundamental principle in a democracy. Community review of citizen complaints supports good police practices and insures best community oriented policing. Recent reforms including those mandated by the State Attorney General have paid off in a sharp reduction in lawsuits and settlements. Do not be swayed by the scare tactics of the Measure's opponents.

By: Dr. Damon Castillo, Jr.

Art Garcia

Rose Mayes

Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "JJ"

(Mail-Ballot Elections for Bonded Indebtedness; Sale of Bonds by Competitive or Negotiated Sale)

This measure contains two proposed amendments to the City of Riverside Charter.

The first proposed amendment pertains to the City's ability to conduct elections for general obligation bonded indebtedness by mail-ballot rather than by polling place election. "General bonded indebtedness" means bonds which are paid from taxes levied on property in the City based on assessed valuation. Current law requires the City to conduct elections for approval of such bonded indebtedness through polling-place elections where voters either appear and vote or vote by absentee ballot. If passed by a majority of the voters, this measure would allow the City Council to determine, by ordinance, that such an election could be conducted as a mail-ballot election. In a mail-ballot election, the voters would vote and return ballots that are mailed to them. The voting process would be similar to the process for voting absentee ballots.

The second proposed amendment pertains to the City's ability to sell bonds by negotiated sale. State law requires cities to sell general obligation bonds to investors by public sale with published notice inviting bids. If passed by a majority of the voters, this measure would allow the City Council to determine, by ordinance, that it is in the best interest of the City that general obligation bonds be sold by negotiated sale rather than by public sale with notice inviting bids. In a negotiated sale, the City would negotiate the terms of the sale of the bonds with a single investment banking firm which would market the bonds to the public.

If Measure "JJ" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "JJ." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "JJ"

The voters and the taxpayers of Riverside deserve the best fiscal practices to assure the least cost for borrowed funds. The Riverside City Charter should be updated and modernized to allow for both a traditional bidding process and a negotiated sale of public debt.

The Charter should also be amended to allow the use of mail-ballot elections. The financial obligations of our city should be of paramount concern to all citizens. In addition to the cost savings of mail-ballot elections, broad voter turnout through mail-ballot elections assures the greatest participation of Riverside voters on these important issues.

The members of the Riverside Charter Review Committee unanimously recommend a Yes vote on Charter Measure "JJ."

By: The Riverside Charter Review Committee

Eric Haley, Chair
Riverside Charter Review Committee

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "JJ"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "KK"

(Bidder's Security for Public Works Projects Bids; Design-Build Procurement for Public Works Projects)

This measure contains two proposed amendments to the City of Riverside Charter.

The first proposed amendment pertains to the City's requirement that all bidders for public works projects provide a certain form of "bidder's security." Current law provides that every bid submitted for a public works project must be accompanied by either a certified or cashier's check, or a bidder's bond issued by a surety company. The purpose of this security is to provide financial assurance that the bidder will honor his or her bid if awarded a contract, because if the bidder fails to so honor the bid, the City can retain the check or demand payment on the bond from the surety company, as applicable. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow the City to accept other forms of bidder's security, as determined by ordinance of the City Council. An example of another form of bidder's security that this measure would allow is an electronic funds transfer.

The second proposed amendment pertains to the City's authorization to use a design-build process for public works projects. Current law provides that the design and construction of public works projects be done by a design-bid-build process. The current design-bid-build process is described as follows. The City uses a qualifications-based selection and price negotiation process to retain an architect or engineer to prepare design plans and specifications for a public works project. Then the City issues requests for bids to construction contractors to build the public works project based on those design plans and specifications. Except for limited circumstances, the City must then award the contract to construct that public works project, as described in the plans and specifications, to the lowest responsive bidder.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow the City to determine, by ordinance, that for particular projects the City could procure the design and construction of public works projects through a competitive negotiation process rather than a competitive bidding process.

If Measure "KK" is approved, the fiscal impact to the City is unknown.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "KK." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "KK"

This measure updates the Charter to allow the City Council, if it chooses, to use two contracting tools on City public works projects that are available in other jurisdictions and for private sector projects.

The first would allow bids to be accompanied by any form of bidder's security that the Council authorizes for that contract. This will allow use of modern financial tools such as letters of credit.

The second allows the Council to use the frequently less expensive and faster design-build process on public works projects that already can be used on public utilities contracts. While this process of hiring one firm to both design and build a project eliminates finger pointing between architects and general contractors and may speed project development, it may not always be appropriate. That is why this Charter amendment does not require it, but allows our elected City officials to choose design-build, if it would be more practical for a particular project.

By: Marcia McQuern

Ben Johnson, II

Barry C. Johnson

Eric Haley

Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "KK"

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "LL"

(City's Independent Auditor)

Current law provides that the City Council shall annually employ a qualified public accountant to examine the City's financial documents and to submit an audit report.

If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would require the City to change public accountants at least every five years. This means that the City could not employ the same accountant to perform these functions for more than five consecutive years at a time.

If Measure "LL" is approved, the fiscal impact to the City is unknown.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "LL." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "LL"

To insure a truly independent audit system, as was intended by the inclusion of this process in the City's Charter, it shall become not practice nor choice but mandatory for a rotation of accounting firms, every five years. Currently, each auditing firm is given a five (5) year contract and, at the end of that contract, along with other firms, may re-apply for renewal of the contract for five more years, upon appointment by City Council. There currently is no limit to the number of times a firm's contract may be renewed.

The purpose of an independent audit is to check the accountability of the City to the citizens where finances are concerned. To provide this as an independent service, a firm should not become too comfortable in its position nor the City too comfortable with that audit service so as not to perform at the level intended. In the last 17 years, there have been 4 different firms providing audit services to the City, making their service approximately 4.5 years each. The City is, apparently, already practicing what the Charter Review Committee has recommended become mandatory. Mandatory rotation of service provider after five years shall help insure the most credible audit services for the City.

By: Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

Eric Haley
Charter Review Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE "LL"

The Charter currently requires that a public accountant audit the City's financial statements each year. The City rebids the audit work every five years with the incumbent firm given the opportunity to continue. The Charter Review Committee is recommending the independent auditor be rotated every five years.

Corporate failures and reported conspiracy by independent accountants have raised concern about auditor independence. In response, Congress passed legislation addressing these concerns, requiring the U.S. General Accounting Office ("GAO") to study the potential effects of periodic mandatory rotation of auditors. On 11-21-03 the GAO issued its report. Survey respondents overwhelmingly opposed mandatory audit firm rotation. The GAO concluded:

- Industry and organization specific knowledge is cumulative, built up over a number of years. The early years of an audit relationship require significantly increased hours to document systems, controls, risk factors, and understanding the client's business. This leads to a reduced likelihood of detecting material misstatements.
- Auditors would charge higher fees because of the shorter time over which the additional early year costs can be recovered and because of increased marketing costs.
- Audit clients will incur additional costs because of the more frequent effort to orient the new auditor to the organization.
- Audit committees can decide if auditors are too complacent.
- Rotating audit partners accomplishes the "fresh look" objective.

Additionally, the State Controller considered mandatory auditor rotation for schools but decided instead to require rotation of the audit partners after five years. California municipal finance officers were also surveyed regarding mandatory auditor rotation requirements. From approximately fifty responses, only one city indicated such a requirement.

We believe amending the Charter is unnecessary. While advantages exist to rotating auditors periodically, making this business decision a charter requirement, removing it from the City's Finance professionals, is not a change we believe best serves the City of Riverside.

By: Paul C. Sundeen
Finance Director
City of Riverside

IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEASURE "MM"

(City of Riverside’s Board of Public Utilities)

This measure contains three proposed amendments to the City of Riverside Charter.

The first portion of this measure concerns the power of the City’s Board of Public Utilities (“the Board”) to award and authorize public utilities department contracts. The current Charter provides that most procurements of goods, services and construction for the public utilities department be approved by both the Board of Public Utilities and the City Council if the procurement exceeds \$50,000. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would authorize the Board, instead of the City Council, to award contracts for public utilities public works projects, purchases of equipment, materials, supplies, goods and services, if the procurement exceeds \$50,000, and authorizes the City Manager or his designee to execute such contracts or issue purchase orders, as appropriate. The limitation on such power is that the funds for such contracts must be included in the City Council-approved budget for public utilities.

The second portion of this measure concerns work done at the request and expense of a customer of the City’s Public Utilities. Current law provides that such work be approved by both the Board of Public Utilities and the City Council. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow the Director of Public Utilities to authorize and execute contracts for such work. The two limitations on the director’s power would be that the work must be done pursuant to rules established by the Board and approved by the City Council, and if the cost of such work exceeds \$100,000, that the City Manager must approve as well.

The third portion of this measure concerns individual contracts with public utilities department customers for water, electric and any other utility service. Current law provides that all such individualized contracts be approved by both the Board of Public Utilities and the City Council. If passed by a majority of voters, this measure would allow the Director of Public Utilities to negotiate and execute such individualized contracts for such utilities. The limitation on the director’s power would be that the rate under such utility contracts would be established by the Board and approved by the City Council in accordance with existing Charter provisions.

If Measure "MM" is approved, there would be no direct fiscal impact to the City.

By: City Attorney
City of Riverside

The above statement is an impartial analysis of Measure "MM." If you desire a copy of the proposed Charter language, please call the City Clerk at 951-826-5557 and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you or view the full text at www.riversideca.gov.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEASURE "MM"

The City should be allowed to serve its utility customers faster than the current charter allows. Under this proposal, the City Council would still control all spending and policies.

This measure allows the utilities board to execute contracts that are within the scope of work and budget already approved by the Council. It would allow the City utilities director to approve work done at the request and expense of customers. It also would allow the director to negotiate and execute contracts with individual retail customers following rules and rates previously approved by the Council. This latter change would allow the City to attract and retain economically important institutions and companies and, if de-regulation returns, would allow the City to compete for the utility business of its biggest customers.

The current charter’s requirement that all these contracts return to the council for unnecessary redundant votes delays projects for at least 30 days, if not two months.

By: Marcia McQuern

Dorothy Bailey

Sharon L. B. Tyrrell

Eric Haley

Ben Johnson, II

NO ARGUMENT FILED AGAINST MEASURE "MM"



NOTICE TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER

A “YES” or “NO” printed under the handicapped symbol /arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet indicates whether or not your assigned polling place is accessible to physically handicapped voters. Please be advised of your right to vote in the following alternate ways:

- A. Vote early at one of our Early Voting locations listed on the back cover.
- B. By mail. You may request an absentee ballot and vote by mail. 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.
- C. Outside the Polling Place. If you are unable to enter the polling place because of a physical handicap, you may vote in a place that is as near as possible to the polling place and that is accessible to the physically handicapped (i.e., your car). Prior to receiving your ballot you will be required to sign the Handicapped Voter Certificate in lieu of signing the Roster Index of Voters.

33-PERM (REVISED 08-10-04)

FROM — REMITE



**FIRST
CLASS
POSTAGE**

PLACE STAMP HERE
PONGA ESTAMPILLA AQUI

**DID YOU SIGN YOUR APPLICATION?
¿FIRMO USTED SU SOLICITUD?**

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
2724 GATEWAY DRIVE
RIVERSIDE CA 92507-0923**



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



NONPROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Registrar of Voters
Riverside

✓ **You May Cast Your Absentee Ballot Early
by TOUCH SCREEN**

October 4 thru November 2

At

THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
2724 Gateway Drive, Riverside, CA

OR

October 21 thru October 30

GALLERIA AT TYLER
1299 Galleria at Tyler Riverside, CA


HEMET VALLEY MALL
2200 W. Florida Ave., Hemet, CA

THE PROMENADE IN TEMECULA
40820 Winchester Road, Temecula, CA

WESTFIELD'S SHOPPINGTOWN IN PALM DESERT
72840 Highway 111, Palm Desert, CA



LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
↓ UBICACION DE SU URNA DE VOTACION ↓



**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
SOLICITUD PARA BALOTA AUSENTE**

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 26, 2004
APLICACION TIENE QUE SER RECIBIDA NO MAS TARDE DEL 26 DE OCTUBRE DE 2004

**BALLOT
TYPE**

I hereby request an absentee ballot for the Consolidated General Election, November 2, 2004.
Por la presente solicito una balota ausente para la Elección Consolidada General, 2 de noviembre de 2004.

PLEASE PRINT:

NAME AS REGISTERED Imprima el nombre como está registrado

RESIDENCE ADDRESS AS REGISTERED/Imprima la dirección de su residencia como registrado

CITY Ciudad STATE Estado ZIP Zona Postal

I declare, under penalty of perjury that the information provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. / Declaro bajo pena del perjurio que la información proporcionada es verdad y correcta al mejor de mi conocimiento.

**SIGNATURE
REQUIRED**
FIRMA REQUERIDA

SIGNATURE OF VOTER Firma de votar

DATE Fecha

MAIL BALLOT TO:
ADDRESS (IF DIFFERENT) Dirección postal (si es diferente)
CITY Ciudad STATE Estado ZIP Zona Postal

POSTMASTER DELIVER TO

