



BALLOT MEASURE L

REBUTTAL Argument to Argument Written Against Measure L - Inspector General

For several years, two consecutive Charter Review Commissions have recommended establishing a confidential, independent process to investigate wrongdoing by appointing an Inspector General. Opponents of Measure L, primarily real estate insiders and politicians, argue that it's untested in California, could be costly (just 0.066% of the \$1.5 billion budget), and that the City Council can act without a charter amendment. Some also object because the Inspector General wouldn't be an elected official.

Currently, the City's ethics code does not apply to its employees, including senior management, legal counsel, contractors, and outside vendors. Well-intentioned council members, who often have part-time jobs, lack the training to conduct investigations, and the Press Enterprise no longer holds City Hall accountable. This leaves immense power in the hands of a few who manage a \$1.5 billion budget and make decisions affecting your utility bills and Riverside's growth.

Considerable effort was made crafting a compromise addressing many of the oppositions' concerns. Powerful interests don't want Measure L to pass, and many residents feel intimidated about publicly supporting it. As former Chairs and Vice Chairs of Charter Review, it's our responsibility to explain this historic opportunity.

Riverside should lead in improving municipal governance. Inspector General offices have been established across the country and have been proven to deter wrongdoing, serve as an important check on power, and saves taxpayer money.

Riverside's charter process gives voters the direct opportunity to create a watchdog in City Hall.

dedicated to protecting all residents.

Vote Yes.

/s/

Pete Benavidez, Riverside Charter Review Committee

R. Ben Clymer Jr., Charter Review

Malissa Hathaway McKeith, Charter Review Vice Chair