

Joint County Voters' Pamphlet Measure Argument

Important! Read all instructions before completing this form.

Use this form when filing a "Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet" with your County Elections office. Please note that each county produces a separate County Voters' Pamphlet. If the jurisdiction is located in more than one county, a separate "Measure Argument for Voters' Pamphlet" form must be filed with a paid filing fee or certified petition to each county where the Argument is to be printed.

Filing Information

Election: Primary General Special 11/05/2019
 Original Statement Amended Statement Measure # 26 202
 Argument in Favor Argument in Opposition Order # A-1

"This information furnished by" (as it should appear in the Voters' Pamphlet) Name of person required ORS 251.355(2)

Name of person: (required) Paul J. Wilcox Organization Name: (if applicable)

Argument paid for or petition provided by:

Paul J. Wilcox E-mail: pauljwilcox@comcast.net
Name of person/organization paying or submitting petition for Argument
Phone: Cell: 503-758-8199 Work: Home:

Contact information for authorized changes:

Paul J. Wilcox E-mail: pauljwilcox@comcast.net
Name of person authorized to make changes to Argument
Phone: Cell: 503-758-8199 Work: Home:

Filer Checklist for Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet (VP)

- Typewritten & signed Measure Argument form and attached Argument for County VP.
- Fee or certified petition (Petition ID # _____) provided.
- (If applicable) Endorsement Statement #: _____.
- Word Count (325 MAX).

By signing this document, I (we) hereby state I (we) am (are) responsible for the content of this argument, (ORS 251.415)

Organization name person(s) is (are) authorized to represent, if applicable: _____

<u>Paul J. Wilcox</u>		<u>8/30/2019</u>
Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
_____	_____	_____
Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
_____	_____	_____
Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
_____	_____	_____

Note: If this argument is not being filed by a registered Oregon Political Committee, you may be required to register as a political committee with the Secretary of State. Refer to the Campaign Finance Manual for further details.

For Office Use Only:

County: Multnomah Required Info? Yes No Word Count (325 max):
Cash-receipt #: _____ Signed? Yes No Providing digital copy? Yes No
Check #: 1638 Endorsements? Yes # _____ No Received digital copy? Yes No
Amount \$: 350 Review Staff Initials: W

RECEIVED
19 SEP - 3 PM 2:48
TIM SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

One of the arguments in favor of restoring Old City Hall has been that it eliminates the expense of currently leased office space. According to the 2019-2020 City budget, a combined total of \$62,440 has been allocated for that cost for the year. The estimated cost of a bond to the taxpayers is in the range of \$400,000-\$500,000 per year, for twenty-one years.

In a staff report presented to Council on 3/14/19, FFA Architecture and Interiors “estimates that the reconstructed facility would have a useful life of 20-30 years.” How many of you would sign onto a mortgage which foresaw your home having reached the end of its useful life at the same time that the mortgage was being paid off?

The estimated bond cost is \$0.28 per \$1,000 of assessed property value, or \$56.00 per year for a property assessed at \$200,000. While about \$1.00 per week might seem like a minimal amount, keep in mind that the tax burden will apply to the property for twenty-one years, exceeding \$1,000 total before it has been paid off. Also, there is no guarantee that the entire project will be completed for the requested bond amount. The City would have to cover any cost over-runs.

The other major argument for the restoration is that it will allow “some” staff consolidation in a single location. While this would be the immediate effect, the proposed structure would be marginally adequate from a space-needs standpoint. While all inter-related staff should ideally be in a single location, having staff dispersed should not present insurmountable obstacles with all the digital forms of communication now available. Staff has managed successfully since 2012 under the current arrangement.

Is it worth this amount of taxpayer funds to refurbish a nearly 100-year-old, wood-frame building?

I strongly recommend a NO vote on Measure 26-202, as the proposal is not fiscally responsible.