

MULTNOMAH COUNTY

MICED 011 (Rev. 06/2006)

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Primary Election 20__ General Election 20__ Special Election 5/15/07
(date)

Measure No.: 26-92 Argument in Favor
 Argument in Opposition

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

Name of person:
Nohad Toulan

Original Argument

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

Amended Argument

Name and Address of Contact Person (person who could authorize changes to argument)

Argument Paid For By: (name and address)
DOUG BLOM GREN
1656 SE 25th
Portland, OR 97214

Telephone (home)

Telephone (work)

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.

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)

3/19/2007
Date signed

JOHN
DIRECTOR
07MAY19 10:53
R

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Staff Initials WS

Argument order number A-1

Cash or Check Number 3063

Statement(s) of Endorsement? NO YES # 1

Receipt Number 21844

Word/Number Count Total 324

WOULD THINGS YOU LOVE ABOUT PORTLAND EXIST UNDER
MEASURE 26-92?

DON'T RISK IT. VOTE NO.

If all you knew about urban renewal in Portland came from politicians, you might want to overhaul it, like Measure 26-92 would. But be careful about throwing away something that has served Portland well.

Pioneer Square, MAX, Waterfront Park, Riverplace, Chinese Garden, historic Meier and Frank Building, are just a fraction of major urban renewal projects in Portland.

Start-up loans for neighborhood businesses, affordable apartments, low interest home rehabilitation loans, recruiting and retaining businesses to create jobs are key PDC initiatives. These are all in the urban renewal system that has made Portland a model city.

In 1958, voters created an urban renewal system where:

Elected officials (City Council):

- Set policy,
- Establish and approve urban renewal areas and plans,
- Issue urban renewal bonds,
- Appoint commissioners to oversee urban renewal.

Appointed citizen volunteers (Portland Development Commission):

- Set urban renewal budgets,
- Serve as the directors for the urban renewal agency,
- Implement City Council policy and plans.

Why this structure?

- Holds elected officials accountable for policy but prevents them from using urban renewal money for political goals.
- Makes qualified citizen volunteers directly accountable for implementing urban renewal decisions.

We need to keep this.

Would so many projects that benefit the city have been completed if elected politicians had complete control of urban renewal expenditures, as under Measure 26-92? Or would they use the money to build political careers and satisfy supporters?

The citizen Charter Review Commission recommended maintaining our system with minor modifications designed to enhance the city's responsiveness to community needs. City Council drastically changed the recommendations to make themselves the PDC budget committee. You have to ask yourself why?

We can't risk the future of our City. Vote No on Measure 26-92.

BUD CLARK
Former Portland Mayor

NOHAD A TOULAN
Charter Review Commission Member
PSU Urban & Public Affairs Emeritus Dean

MULTNOMAH COUNTY

MCFD 011 Rev. 06 2006

Measure Argument for County Voters' Pamphlet

Primary Election 20__ General Election 20__ Special Election 5/15/07
(date)

Measure No.: 26-92 Argument in Favor
 Argument in Opposition

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

Vera Katz

Original Argument

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

Amended Argument

Name and Address of Contact Person (person who could authorize changes to argument)
Nancy J. Hamilton

Argument Paid For By: (name and address)

Telephone (home)
503-312-1295

Telephone (work)

Doug Blomgren

1656 SE 25th Ave
Portland, OR 97214

ATTACHED IS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

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

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)

Vera Katz

3/19/07

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

Date signed

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Staff Initials LD
Cash or Check Number 3083
Receipt Number ~~308~~ 21844

Argument order number ~~1~~ 1-2
Statement(s) of Endorsement? NO YES # _____
Word/Number Count Total 308

RECEIVED
07 MAR 19 PM 4:33
JOHN R. AUFFMAN
DIRECTOR OF ELECTIONS

MEASURE 26-92

- 1. DESTROYS ALMOST 50 YEARS OF CHECKS AND BALANCES;**
- 2. HANDS OVER URBAN RENEWAL SPENDING TO POLITICIANS;**
- 3. GIVES CITY COUNCIL AUTHORITY OVER MULTNOMAH COUNTY AND SCHOOL FUNDS.**

VOTE "NO" ON MEASURE 26-92

Since 1958, Portland's urban renewal has been the envy of cities worldwide. We have an elected City Council that sets policy, approves urban renewal districts and plans and appoints volunteer citizens to oversee expenditures.

Measure 26-92 would hand over urban renewal spending to politicians. (Remember water bureau billing system cost overruns, the tram, the expensive takeover attempt of PGE, covering reservoirs in Mt. Tabor Park, etc.?) Would that be wise?

Also, consider whether it's fair to give City of Portland politicians control over money that isn't even theirs to spend. Most urban renewal money is not City of Portland tax money. More than 60% would otherwise go to Multnomah County for social services, jails, bridges and other essentials, and for school funding. Why hand spending authority to Portland politicians?

Voters thoughtfully decided in 1958 against giving complete control over urban renewal money to elected officials, fearing they might be motivated by personal or political goals such as reelection and helping campaign supporters. Instead, our system allows citizen volunteers to direct urban renewal spending, following City policy.

Read Measure 26-92 carefully and ask yourself:

1. Are you prepared to destroy a balanced system in place since 1958?
2. Do you want to put control over urban renewal spending entirely in politicians' hands?
3. Is it fair for Portland City Council to determine how to spend the 60% of urban renewal money that would otherwise go for essential Multnomah County services and school funding?

**CREATING A BALANCE OF POWER FOR URBAN RENEWAL SPENDING WAS
A GOOD DECISION BY VOTERS IN 1958.**

**PRESERVING IT IS A GOOD DECISION NOW.
VOTE "NO" ON 26-92**

VERA KATZ
Former Portland Mayor
Advisor, Charter Review Commission