

MULTNOMAH COUNTY

MCCD 011 (Rev. 01 2011)

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Primary Election 20 14 General Election 20 14 Special Election May 20, 2014
(date)

Measure No.: 26-157 Argument in Favor
 Argument in Opposition

This Information Furnished By (as it should appear in the county voters' pamphlet):

Name of person:
Allen Cox

Original Argument

Amended Argument

Name of organization person is authorized to represent, if applicable:

Name and Address of Contact Person (person who could authorize changes to argument)
Allen Cox, 2086 SE Wonderview Ct. Gresham, Or.

Telephone (home)
503.799.1234

Telephone (work)

Argument Paid For By: (name and address)
Allen Cox, 2086 SW Wonderviwe Ct. Gresham . Or 97080

ATTACHED IS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Measure Argument
 Statement(s) of Endorsement, if applicable (number filed: _____)

Note: Language that violates any provision of ORS 251.405 or 251.415 may be excluded from the voters' pamphlet.

RECEIVED
14 MAR 18 PM 12:38
TIM SCOTT
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

By signing this document, I hereby state I am responsible for the content of this argument. ORS 251.415 (2)

Signature redacted

3/18/2014

Signature of person furnishing argument
(must be person listed in "This information furnished by" box above)

Date signed

Note: If this argument is not being filed by a registered Oregon Political Committee, you may be required to register as a political committee or submit a Statement of Independent Expenditures (PC 10) with the Secretary of State. Refer to the Campaign Finance Manual for further information.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Staff Initials LD

Argument order number A-1

Cash or Check Number 1474

Statement(s) of Endorsement? NO YES # _____

Receipt Number 23243

Word/Number Count Total _____

City of Gresham

26 - 157

IS IT FAIR ?

Historical Real Median Family Income for Oregon has suffered a loss of 9.2% from 2007 to 2012. (WWW.deptofnumbers.com)

According to the city of Gresham's website from the budget year 07/08 to the proposed budget for this year the Police Department has had an 11.2% increase and fire department a 16.3% increase.

Over and above the property taxes the city now collects you have been paying an additional \$7.50 per month (\$90 per year) on your utility bill to augment the police and fire budget. If you approve this measure and your home is tax assessed at \$200,000 this figure will jump to \$250 a year. (277% increase the first year) and that increase is projected to grow by 25.5% over the five-year duration of this measure. Those of you who rent would likely see a \$21 a month increase in your rent the first year in addition to the normal increase as a result of property taxes.

Will your net income increases equal or exceed these percentages?

Are our public employees uniquely entitled to these large increases regardless of the taxpayer's ability to pay?

Is it reasonable we should guarantee our public employees jobs, benefits and increases when we can't guarantee our own?