STATEMENT BY PROPONENTS/AUTHORS OF ARGUMENTS

(Section 9600 of the Elections Code requires that all arguments concerning measures filed pursuant to this division shall be accompanied by the following form statement, to be signed by each proponent and by each author, if different, of the argument).

The undersigned proponent(s) or author(s) of the PRIMARY (PRIMARY/REBUTTAL) argument AGAINST (IN FAVOR OF/AGAINST)

ballot proposition B (NAME OR NUMBER) at the _____ (TITLE OF ELECTION)

election for the City of Riverside (JURISDICTION) to be held on 3-5-24 (DATE)

hereby state that this argument is true and correct to the best of Rich Gardner (HIS/HER/THEIR) knowledge and belief.

PROPONENT'S/AUTHOR'S NAME:	SIGNATURE:
1. Rich Gardner PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL)	[redacted] SIGNATURE
[redacted] ADDRESS	[redacted] (PHONE) 12-18-23 DATE
2. PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL)	SIGNATURE
ADDRESS	(PHONE) DATE
3. PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL)	SIGNATURE
ADDRESS	(PHONE) DATE
4. PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL)	SIGNATURE
ADDRESS	(PHONE) DATE
5. PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL)	SIGNATURE
ADDRESS	(PHONE) DATE

In order to enable the elections official to determine whether it qualifies as a bona fide association of citizens, an organization or association submitting an argument for or against a measure shall submit with its argument a copy of one of the following:

(1) Its articles of incorporation, articles of association, partnership documents, bylaws, or similar documents.

(2) Letterhead containing the name of the organization and its principal officers.

(3) If the organization or association is a primarily formed committee established to support or oppose the measure, its statement of organization filed pursuant to Section 84101 of the Government Code.

Argument Against Measure B

Riverside is finally allowed to vote on some facet involving cannabis dispensaries. Is an industry standard of a 10 % tax sufficent? Could a higher tax been voted for and win? City Council basically refuses to acknowledge that the immediate impact of legalized pot shops is an increase in crime, hence our city would require more police officers. The mere fact that they are adding five full time overseers at a cost of almost a half million dollars should speak volumes to the rocky road ahead of us.

While the measure states “potentially’ it could add over two million to the general fund, nowhere do they mention the aforementioned cost or that statistically speaking for every dollar in profits cities are spending three for public safety. Please note this money is going to the general fund where council will spend as they choose.

Two different cities have voted on a 15% tax rate and won on the ballot. The extra five percent could help us with the extra cost of enforcement and public safety.

To me one of the most disturbing aspects of this whole issue is having council members ignore all the negative evidence and comments from concerned citizens. It is almost like they do not care or they have something to gain by allowing 14 pot shops in Riverside.

A vote of NO on this measure would tell our council that this is still our city and we deserve the right to have a say in what goes on.

People can always purchase cannabis on line. What this is basically doing is like adding 14 liquor stores into neighborhoods. We deserve better than this.

Rich Gardner
12/18/23