Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Important! Please read all instructions before completing this form. This form is to be used 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 or district is located in more than one county a separate 'Measure Argument for Voters' Pamphlet' form must be filed and the fee paid to each county where the argument is to be printed.

RECEIVED
16 SEP -7 PM 2:58
TIM SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

Filing Information

Election: ☐ Primary 20____ ☒ General 2016 ☐ Special_____

Measure # 3-491 ☒ Original Statement ☐ Amended Statement

Order # F-1 ☐ Argument in Favor ☒ Argument in Opposition

"This Information furnished by" (as it should appear in the Voters' Pamphlet):

Jeff Gudman

Argument paid for by:

Jeff Gudman E-Mail: JGudman7150@msn.com

Name of person or organization paying for argument

Phone: Cell: 503-780-1524 Work: 503-697-7150 Home: 503-697-7150

Contact Information for authorized changes:

Jeff Gudman E-Mail: JGudman7150@MSN.COM

Name of person authorized to make changes to Argument

Phone: Cell: 503-780-1524 Work: 503-697-7150 Home: 503-697-7150

Filer checklist for Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet (VP).

- ☒ Typewritten & signed Measure Argument form and Argument for County VP.
- ☒ Fee or certified petition provided.
- ☒ (If applicable) Endorsement Statement #: 3-491
- ☒ 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

Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
Jeff Gudman		5/6/16

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

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 ☐ Cash-receipt #:_____ ☒ Check #: 12482 Amount $ 200.00

Required Info? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Signed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Endorsements? ☐ Yes # ☒ No

Intake Staff Initials: JER

Word Count (325 max): 325

Digital copy? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Review Staff Initials: JER

Fiber Follies

The Sunstone Financial/Symmetrical Networks proposal for a public/private partnership fiber network with eventual city ownership is not in the city's best interests. Providing better service at lower cost without risk to taxpayer residents is. The proposal fails. Risks outweigh benefits.

The proposal has the city on the hook for 30 years ensuring a $197,000 monthly guaranteed payment to Sunstone Financial/Symmetrical Networks for a 35% "take rate" for fiber service.

The city has been or will be a part of public/private partnerships.... Lakeview Village, Wizer and North Anchor. The City did not guarantee a 35% take/occupancy rate for any of them.

Sunstone Financial/Symmetrical Networks, a startup company, is asking the city to financially backstop the deal. Sunstone Financial/Symmetrical Networks is unwilling to release the entire set of financial projections.

Imagine the cost if you had to replace all coaxial cable currently embedded in your walls with fiber cable.

The world is going wireless, rather than wired.

The city getting into a new line of business, when we are not performing all core city services exceptionally well

Sunstone Financial has never built a built/operated fiber networks before.

The likely sign up rate of 34.7% provides the city no financial margin of safety.

This arrangement is called "take or pay". You want to be the receiving end, not the payment end of this arrangement. For Sunstone/Symmetrical, this arrangement is "heads I win, tails you lose."

There will be additional city overhead costs.

The proposal provides a pipe, not content. Everyone will be responsible to secure their content for additional dollars along with the hassle of multiple pieces of equipment and bills from different providers.

When things go wrong in the internet service the city will be blamed.

Investing in speed for speed's sake and not for benefits that the investment can deliver is a mistake.

The Sunstone Financial/Symmetrical Networks proposal is the wrong proposal at the wrong time in the wrong place.

Jeff Gudman
City Council

325 words (325 limit)

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Important! Please read all instructions before completing this form. This form is to be used 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 or district is located in more than one county a separate 'Measure Argument for Voters' Pamphlet' form must be filed and the fee paid to each county where the argument is to be printed.

Filing Information

Election: ☐ Primary 20____ ☑ General 20 16 ☐ Special_____

Measure # 3 - 491 ☐ Original Statement ☐ Amended Statement

Order # A - 1 ☐ Argument in Favor ☑ Argument in Opposition

"This information furnished by" (as it should appear in the Voters' Pamphlet):

Taxpayer Association of Oregon

Argument paid for by:

Taxpayer Association of Oregon E-Mail: oregonwatchdog@gmail.com

Name of person or organization paying for argument

Phone: Cell: Work: (503) 603-9009 Home:

RECEIVED
16 SEP 12 PM 12:49
TIM SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

Contact information for authorized changes:

Jason Williams E-Mail: oregonwatchdog@gmail.com

Name of person authorized to make changes to Argument

Phone: Cell: Work: (503) 603-9009 Home:

Filer checklist for Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet (VP).

- ☐ Typewritten & signed Measure Argument form and Argument for County VP.
- ☐ Fee or certified petition 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

Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
Jason Williams	Jason Williams	09/12/16

Organization name person(s) is(are) authorized to represent, if applicable: Taxpayer Association of Oregon

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 ☐ Cash-receipt #: 23691 ☒ Check #: 2747 Amount $ 200

Required Info? ☒ Yes ☐ No Signed? ☒ Yes ☐ No Endorsements? ☐ Yes # ☒ No

Intake Staff Initials:

Word Count (325 max): Digital copy? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Review Staff Initials:

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Measure # 3 - 491 (Order #_____)

Maximum 325 words/numbers.

VOTE NO ON LAKE OSWEGO MEASURE 3-941
CONSIDER:

• Proven Failure -- Plans to build a city broadband network have failed miserably in Portland and Seattle.

• Costs Explode -- Lessons from failed government broadband projects from all across the nation show that they suffer from cost-overruns

• Taxpayer Bailout -- The promise that taxpayers won't pay anything means absolutely nothing the moment that sign-ups don't meet projections -- which will require our tax dollars to bailout the losses.

• Hiding Costs -- Critics are slamming the City for creating a brand new utility without budgeting for staff to handle billing and customer service.

• False comparison -- Supporters cite Sandy and Independence as role models, but fail to mention that these are remote small rural towns with broadband access problems.

• Extreme Risk -- Consumer trends, competition and technology breakthroughs swing wildly in the technology industry. The City wants to dump millions in this high risk business field.

Follow us - OregonWatchdog.com (since 1999)

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Important! Please read all instructions before completing this form. This form is to be used 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 or district is located in more than one county a separate 'Measure Argument for Voters' Pamphlet' form must be filed and the fee paid to each county where the argument is to be printed.

Filing Information

Election: ☐ Primary 20____ ☑ General 20 16 ☐ Special_____

Measure # 3 - 491 ☐ Original Statement ☐ Amended Statement

Order # A-2 ☐ Argument in Favor ☑ Argument in Opposition

"This information furnished by" (as it should appear in the Voters' Pamphlet):

Bill Tierney and Jeff Gudman

Argument paid for by:

Legislative Advocates E-Mail: mdewey@legadv.com

Name of person or organization paying for argument

Phone: Cell: Work: (503) 581-2845 Home:

Contact information for authorized changes:

Bill Tierney E-Mail: wjtierney503@gmail.com

Name of person authorized to make changes to Argument

Phone: Cell: (503) 539-7144 Work: Home:

RECEIVED
16 SEP 12 PM 12:49
TIM SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

Filer checklist for Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet (VP).

- ☑ Typewritten & signed Measure Argument form and Argument for County VP.
- ☑ Fee or certified petition 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

Printed name of person furnishing argument	Signature of person furnishing argument	Date
Bill Tierney		09/12/16
Jeff Gudman		09/12/16

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

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
☑ Cash-receipt #: 23692
☑ Check #: [redacted]7909
Amount $ 200

Required Info? ☑ Yes ☐ No
Signed? ☑ Yes ☐ No
Endorsements? ☐ Yes # ☑ No
Intake Staff Initials:

Word Count (325 max):
Digital copy? ☑ Yes ☐ No
Review Staff Initials:

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Measure #3 - 491 (Order #_____)

Maximum 325 words/numbers.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED BROADBAND NETWORKS ALMOST ALWAYS FAIL!

Key Highlights from a 2014 New York Law School, Advanced Communications Law and Policy Institute paper on government owned broadband networks:

- Bristol, VA--"By one recent estimate the total `principal and interest remaining to be paid on the bond is approximately $73,927,054.' `...there is continued debate as to whether the benefits of the system outweigh the significant public resources that were used to build it.'" page 57
- Lafayette, LA--"...this concern is acute given that its Government Owned Network has not become financially self-sustaining and, after investing more than $150 million, the network has attracted only 14,000 subscribers (there are 48,800 in Lafayette, LA.)" page 63
- Monticello, MN--"Ongoing operational costs and unanticipated expenses proved to be substantial and in excess of initial estimates." page 65
- Cedar Falls, IA--"Much to the dismay of many residents, the local government approved a property tax increase for the coming year. Some of these revenues might have been used to pay for a new highway exchange." page 71
- UTOPIA, UT (16 Utah cities)--"The cost of UTOPIA has been very high: factoring in debt service and other payments, the total cost of the network approaches $500 million. Despite lofty aspirations about UTOPIA being a broadband utopia for residents and business there is broad agreement the government owned network has been a financial failure." page 76
- Groton, CT--"The rise and fall of the government owned network highlights a number of assumptions often made by local officials and others who advocate in favor of municipal broadband deployment." Page 82
- Provo, UT--"The government owned network In Provo, Utah, will forever be linked with Google, the company that purchased the municipal network in 2013 for one dollar." page 83

Source--http://www.nyls.edu/advanced-communications-law-and-policy-institute/wp-content/uploads/sites/169/2013/08/ACLP-Government-Owned-Broadband-Networks-FINAL-June-2014.pdf