

MULTNOMAH COUNTY

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Primary Election 20___ General Election 20___ Special Election Nov. 6, 2007
(date)

Measure No.: 3-273
 Argument in Favor
 Argument in Opposition

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

Original Argument

John Surratt

Amended Argument

Name of organization person is authorized to represent, if applicable:
ASK ME FIRST PAC

Name and Address of Contact Person (person who could authorize changes to argument)
John Surratt 1685 Edgemoor Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Telephone (home)
503-697-7064

Telephone (work)
503-883-2886

Argument Paid For By: (name and address)
Ask Me First PAC, Mary Olson, Treas. 18453 Tamaway Dr. Lake Oswego, OR 97034

ATTACHED IS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Measure Argument
 Statement(s) of Endorsement, if applicable (number filed: 1)

RECEIVED

SEP 10 P.M.

BY [Signature]

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

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

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

Sept 5, 2007
Date signed

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Staff Initials _____

Argument order number ~~288~~ A-1

Cash or Check Number _____

Statement(s) of Endorsement? NO YES # _____

Receipt Number _____

Word/Number Count Total 288

MEASURE ARGUMENT FOR COUNTY VOTERS' PAMPHLET
It is not required to use this part of the form. An attached paper is acceptable.
Word/Number Total = 325 Words/Numbers maximum

In October 2005, the Lake Oswego City Council decided, without voter approval, to purchase the Safeco property. This measure seeks to validate that unilateral decision. It is flawed and self-serving because:

- It makes no commitments and gives no assurances regarding any intended use for the site, or related costs.
- It fails to disclose possible uses that are under consideration, such as the favored \$105 million community center project.
- It fails to inform that \$22,276,000 has already been spent, including the approximately \$300,000 cost of moving the Parks & Recreation Dept. to the site.
- It fails to disclose ongoing annual expenses of \$300,000 for operations and maintenance costs.
- It shows the approximate cost to taxpayers of borrowing \$20 million for **only one year**. It fails to explain that this is a twenty-year obligation.
- It fails to inform the taxpayer of additional costs to modify or add to the building for its ultimate purpose.
- It fails to put this purchase in the context of the City's current debt load and all its impending (necessary) taxpayer indebtedness.
- **It is only an advisory vote, which is not binding on the Council.**

The City Council has decided to offer taxpayers no commitments, representations, or assurances regarding the property's eventual use or attendant costs. You are asked to blindly approve the first \$20 million for public ownership of a property whose future use is vague at best.

This advisory question is open-ended; this is only the tip of the iceberg. Agreeing to keep the Safeco property without more information will open the door to undesirable possibilities. Buyer Beware! A "yes" vote is a blank check.

Please vote NO on measure 3-273

*This statement endorsed by John Suvett
and Mary Olson, ASK ME FIRST PAC*

REQUIRED AND OPTIONAL INFORMATION WORD/NUMBER COUNT TOTAL (325 word/number limit)

~~278~~
291
288