

## Edinger slams Schindelbeck economic stimulus idea:

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. In the weekly "Inlander" for October 22-28, 2015, my opponent stated that he supported "freezing property taxes and waiving impact fees for ten years" in Coeur d'Alene. As a former mayor and current Coeur d'Alene City Councilman, I feel obligated to comment on this latest irresponsible and uninformed proposal by Toby Schindelbeck. The loss of over 204 million dollars in revenue over the next ten years would severely hamstring the ability of our City to increase vital police and fire protection along with other services as the community continues to grow.

My opponent, as a recent newcomer to Coeur d'Alene, appears to not understand the fiscal workings of Coeur d'Alene. The complexities of how budget planning, generating revenue, accounting for inflation and setting priorities takes time, experience and the willingness to research the facts.

This ill-conceived proposal by my opponent is solely based upon assumptions and guesswork rather than any documented evidence. Maybe he should provide examples from his recent residents in his prior home state where the state faces budget deficits as well as a number of the local governments.

I would point out to Mr. Schindelbeck that the City Council and our mayors have been successful in keeping property taxes low and in some years no tax increase, including no property tax increase for the current fiscal year that begin on October 1st, while maintaining first class services during a period of rapid growth.

On the one hand, Mr. Schindelbeck has proposed putting more police officers on the streets, but now he suggests restricting the City's ability to provide the funds for this vital service. It should be noted that we are expanding our police and fire personnel and equipment along with the voters' passage of a ten-year public safety bond that Mayor Steve Widmyer and we Council members put before the voters in May.

For the fiscal year 2015-2016, Coeur d'Alene received \$20,487,990 in property taxes. Lets assume the City receives this same amount of property taxes annually for the next ten years collecting \$204,879,900 in property taxes toward meeting the City's budget obligations. Under my opponent's proposal, we would experience at a minimum \$205 million dollar shortfall in meeting our needs to provide such vital services as police and fire protection, resurfacing old streets, managing our modern clean water and waste water treatment plant, garbage collection, and our nationally recognized leaf pickup and snow removal programs.

My opponent's proposal would also waive impact fees for ten years. Such a misguided idea would prevent the City from passing on a portion of the City's cost of providing water, sewage, streets, etc. to these new developments. Who would pick up those costs?

In our many years working with organization such as Jobs Plus, we know that the creation of jobs through successful recruitment of new industry and businesses involves many factors including a prosperous city that provides vital services.

