


Voters' Pamphlet

Oregon General Election
November 4, 2014



vote!



Kate Brown
Oregon Secretary of State

This voters' pamphlet is provided for assistance
in casting your vote by mail ballot.

KATE BROWN
SECRETARY OF STATE

ROBERT TAYLOR
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE



JIM WILLIAMS
DIRECTOR

255 CAPITOL ST NE, SUITE 501
SALEM, OREGON 97310
(503) 986-1518

Dear Oregon Voters,

I'm pleased to present the 2014 General Election Voters' Pamphlet. Inside you will find valuable information about ballot measures that will affect your rights, as well as candidates who would like to represent you.

If you are not yet registered to vote, you have until October 14 to do so. Paper registration forms must be received by your county elections office by 5 p.m. You can register online until 11:59 p.m. by visiting www.oregonvotes.gov.

As Oregonians, we are fortunate to live in a state that has removed many barriers to voting. We make it easier for voters serving in the military and voters living overseas to get access to a ballot. We use tablets and computers to make it easier for voters with disabilities to cast ballots. And we deliver a ballot in the mail to every registered Oregonian. It's your decision whether to mail in the ballot or drop it off in person.

As your Secretary of State, I encourage all eligible Oregonians to exercise their fundamental right to vote. I also urge Oregonians to inform themselves about ballot measures and candidates. Read arguments on both sides of the measures. Learn where candidates stand on issues that matter to you. That's where the Voters' Pamphlet comes in. It is a great source of information to help you make informed decisions in this election.

Every county in Oregon should strive to have the highest voter participation rate – and it's up to each and every voter to do their part by voting. In the 2014 Primary Election, I challenged voters in Oregon's 36 counties to earn the distinction of having the highest voter participation rate in Oregon - and Grant County voters won that challenge! Congratulations to Grant County voters, and let's see which county wins the challenge for this General Election. Four years ago in the last gubernatorial election, Wheeler County led the state with an 84.5% turnout. Not far behind were Wallowa with 82.5% and Harney with 81.4% turnout. So in this 2014 General Election, I encourage you to look to the people of Wheeler, Wallowa and Harney counties as models. Vote! Be heard! And help your county earn the honor of having the highest voter participation rate in Oregon!

Please remember that all ballots must be received by your county elections office by 8 p.m. on Tuesday, November 4, 2014. Postmarks do not count. If you have questions, please call our toll free hotline at 1-866-ORE-VOTE, or visit our website at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Sincerely,

Kate Brown
Oregon Secretary of State



Voters' Pamphlet

General Election

November 4, 2014

Table of Contents

General Information	
Voters' Pamphlet Information	4
List of Candidates & Measures	6
Oregon Voter Bill of Rights	23
Voters with Disabilities	140
Voter Registration Information	142
Candidates	
Partisan Candidates	8
Nonpartisan Candidates	20
Political Party Statements	
Constitution Party	24
Democratic Party	25
Independent Party	26
Libertarian Party	27
Pacific Green Party	28
Progressive Party	29
Republican Party	30
Working Families Party	31
Measures	
Measure 86	32
Measure 87	39
Measure 88	41
Measure 89	60
Measure 90	69
Measure 91	95
Measure 92	123
Voting Information	
Ballot Instructions	11
Returning Your Ballot	13
County Elections Officials	144
Vote by Mail	146
Additional Information Pages	
Online Resources	5
Election Results	17
Index	
Index of Candidates	147

Voters' Pamphlet

Your official 2014 General Election Voters' Pamphlet provides you with information about candidates who will appear on your ballot.

It includes instructions for marking your ballot, a complete list of federal and state candidates, as well as other information to assist you through the voting process.

Candidate statements are printed as submitted. The state does not correct punctuation, grammar, syntax errors or inaccurate information. The only changes made are attempts to correct spelling errors if the word as originally submitted is not in the dictionary.

The voters' pamphlet has been compiled by the Secretary of State since 1903, when Oregon became one of the first states to provide for the printing and distribution of such a publication. One copy of the voters' pamphlet is mailed to every household in the state. Additional copies are available at the Secretary of State's office, local post offices, courthouses and all county elections offices. It can also be viewed at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Candidates

In the general election, candidates are divided into two sections: partisan candidates and nonpartisan candidates. Partisan candidates appear before nonpartisan candidates. Candidates pay a fee, or submit signatures in lieu of paying the fee, for space in the voters' pamphlet. The information required by law—pertaining to occupation, occupational background, educational background and prior governmental experience—has been certified as true by each candidate.

Measures

For each of the measures in this voters' pamphlet you will find the following information:

- (1) the ballot title;
- (2) the estimate of financial impact;
- (3) an explanation of the estimate of financial impact, if determined to be necessary by the committee;
- (4) the complete text of the proposed measure;
- (5) an impartial statement explaining the measure (explanatory statement);
- (6) a legislative argument in support of the measure; and
- (7) any arguments filed by proponents and opponents of the measure.

The ballot title is generally drafted by the Attorney General's office. It is then distributed to a list of interested parties for public comment. After review of any comments submitted, the ballot title is certified by the Attorney General's office. The certified ballot title can be appealed and may be changed by the Oregon Supreme Court.

The estimate of financial impact for each measure is generally prepared by a committee of state officials including the Secretary of State, the State Treasurer, the Director of the Department of Administrative Services, the Director of the Department of Revenue, and a local government representative selected by the committee members. The committee estimates only the direct impact on state and local governments, based on information presented to the committee. In addition, the committee may choose to provide an explanation of the estimate of financial impact statement.

The explanatory statement is an impartial statement explaining the measure. Each measure's explanatory statement is written by a committee of five members, including two proponents of the measure, two opponents of the measure and a fifth member appointed by the first four committee members, or, if they fail to agree on a fifth member, appointed by the Secretary of State. Explanatory statements can be appealed and may be changed by the Oregon Supreme Court.

Citizens or organizations may file arguments in favor of, or in opposition to, measures by purchasing space for \$1,200 or by submitting a petition signed by 500 voters. Arguments in favor of a measure appear first, followed by arguments in opposition to the measure, and are printed in a random order within each category.

Random Alphabet

Oregon statute (ORS 254.155) requires the Secretary of State to complete a random order of the letters of the alphabet to determine the order in which the names of candidates appear on the ballot.

The alphabet for the 2014 General Election is:

O, Q, C, N, M, R, D, Z, T, H, P, J, A, Y, V, I, K, B, U, G, S, F, L, E, W, X

Website

Most of the information contained in this voters' pamphlet is also available in the Online Voters' Guide at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Español

Una versión en español de algunas partes de la Guía del Elector está a su disposición en el portal del Internet cuya dirección aparece arriba. Conscientes de que este material en línea podría no llegar adecuadamente a todos los electores que necesitan este servicio, se invita a toda persona a imprimir la versión en línea y circularla a aquellos electores que no tengan acceso a una computadora.

Important!

If your ballot is lost, destroyed, damaged or you make a mistake in marking your ballot, you may call your county elections office and request a replacement ballot. One will be mailed to you as long as you request it by October 30. After that, you may pick it up at the elections office. If you have already mailed your original ballot before you realize you made a mistake, you have cast your vote and will not be eligible for a replacement ballot.

Your voted ballot must be returned to your county elections office by 8pm election day, Tuesday, November 4, 2014.

Postmarks do not count!

County elections offices are open on election day from 7am to 8pm.

Voter Information

For questions about voter registration, ballot delivery and return, marking the ballot, requesting a replacement ballot, absentee ballots, signature requirements, the voters' pamphlet, when and where to vote, and other questions about elections and voting, call the toll-free voter information line at 1-866-ORE-VOTE (1-866-673-8683).

Voter information line representatives can provide services in both English and Spanish. TTY services for the hearing impaired are also available at 1-800-735-2900.

Disclaimer

Information provided in statements or arguments submitted by a candidate, a political party, an assembly of electors or a person supporting or opposing a measure have not been verified for accuracy by the State of Oregon.

vote!

www.oregonvotes.gov



Register to vote

You must be registered by October 14, to vote in the 2014 General Election.



Find a dropsite

Your ballot must be received by 8pm on November 4, 2014.



My Vote

Use this online tool to check or update your registration status and track your ballot.

for more information about voting in Oregon



oregonvotes.gov



1 866 673 VOTE / 1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Partisan Candidates

US Senator

Mike Montchalin
Libertarian

Jeff Merkley
Democrat, Independent, Working Families

Christina Jean Lugo
Pacific Green

James E Leuenberger*
Constitution

Monica Wehby
Republican

US Representative

4th District
David L Chester*
Libertarian

Art Robinson
Republican, Constitution

Peter A DeFazio
Democrat, Progressive, Working Families

Mike Beilstein
Pacific Green

Governor

Dennis Richardson
Republican, Independent

Chris Henry*
Progressive

Aaron Auer
Constitution

John Kitzhaber
Democrat, Working Families

Paul Grad*
Libertarian

Jason Levin*
Pacific Green

State Senator

6th District
Lee Beyer
Democrat, Working Families

Michael P Spasaro
Republican, Libertarian

8th District
Betsy L Close
Republican, Libertarian

Sara A Gelser
Democrat, Working Families

State Representative

11th District
Andy Petersen
Republican

Phil Barnhart
Democrat, Working Families

15th District
Andy Olson
Republican, Democrat, Independent

17th District
Rich Harisay
Democrat

Sherrie Sprenger
Republican, Libertarian

County Commissioner

Linn County, Position 1

John K Lindsey
Republican, Democrat

Nonpartisan Candidates

Judge of the Circuit Court

23rd District, Position 2
David E Delsman

County Clerk

Linn County
Steve Druckenmiller*

County Sheriff

Linn County
Bruce Riley

Mayor

City of Albany
Jim Clausen
Sharon Konopa
Charley R Smith*

City Councilor

City of Albany, Ward I-A
Dick Olsen
Kevin P Manske*

City of Albany, Ward II-A
Larry G Martin*
Ray Kopczynski

City of Albany, Ward III-A
Bessie Johnson*

*Candidate chose not to submit a voters' pamphlet statement.

This is a complete listing of federal and state candidates for the November 4, 2014, General Election, as prepared by the Secretary of State for counties covered in this pamphlet. County and local government candidates are listed only if those offices are eligible to appear in this pamphlet. The ballot you receive may include additional local candidates and measures that do not appear in this pamphlet.

Measures

86

Amends Constitution: Requires creation of fund for Oregonians pursuing post-secondary education, authorizes state indebtedness to finance fund

87

Amends Constitution: Permits employment of state judges by National Guard (military service) and state public universities (teaching)

88

Provides Oregon resident "driver card" without requiring proof of legal presence in the United States

89

Amends Constitution: State/political subdivision shall not deny or abridge equality of rights on account of sex

90

Changes general election nomination processes: provides for single primary ballot listing candidates; top two advance

91

Allows possession, manufacture, sale of marijuana by/to adults, subject to state licensing, regulation, taxation

92

Requires food manufacturers, retailers to label "genetically engineered" foods as such; state, citizens may enforce

US Senator



Mike Montchalin

Libertarian

Occupation: Candidate/Retired

Occupational Background: Stock market investor, real estate investor, landlord, motel owner-operator, US navy.

Educational Background:

Portland Community College, Portland State University studying math, physics, Japanese language. (no degrees). informal study: economics, Spanish language

Prior Governmental Experience: (None) One of the principal plaintiffs in *Largent v. Klickitat County*, 2000 WL 896411 (Wash.App.Div., July 6, 2000)

Our country's greatest asset is us - the citizenry. We will continue to be our country's greatest asset so long as we keep ourselves free, prosperous, and principled. We can not tolerate politicians who bail-out Wall Street, create tax code for political advantage, or use the IRS to harrass opponents, or use promises of -jobs- to buy votes, or collaborate with crony capitalists to pass laws which protect them from legitimate liability, or trick us into wars which enrich financiers and weapons manufacturers..... all at our expense.

We all want to leave this world better for the next generation: no wars, less debt, less pollution, less fear, less imprisonment; and more wealth, security, liberty, freedom, and opportunity to pursue happiness.

To these ends our politicians have tried wars and a centrally-controlled incentive-based economy. It has been a failure which is manifested in our exploding debt and deficit. One would think they might audit the FED, or give the Free Market a chance to establish real interest rates and real prices which would signal how production, savings, and debt should be allocated. Instead they have doubled down with more of the same.

Centrally controlled interest rates and the corporate-state-agenda have perverted our economy. The consequences will engulf our good citizenry and some will lose their principles in the ensuing chaos.

We must audit the FED and dismiss all corrupt or misguided politicians.

I understand that our Constitution enumerates powers for the federal government and reserves the rest for local governments. With this understanding I ask for your consent. I ask for your vote.

by Mike Montchalin www.montchalin.com

(This information furnished by Mike Montchalin.)

US Senator



Jeff Merkley

Democrat
Independent
Working Families

Occupation: U.S. Senator

Occupational Background: Executive Director, Portland Habitat for Humanity; National Security Analyst, Pentagon and Congressional Budget Office; President, World Affairs Council of Oregon

Educational Background: David Douglas High School; Stanford (B.A., International Relations); Princeton (M.A., Public Policy)

Prior Governmental Experience: State Representative, 1999-2009; House Democratic Leader, 2003-2007; House Speaker, 2007-2009

Jeff Merkley hasn't forgotten his middle-class roots because he never left them. Jeff's father worked in a sawmill and Jeff was the first in his family to go to college. He lives in the same blue-collar community he grew up in and his children have gone to the same public schools.

Jeff is fighting for middle-class families by creating more living-wage jobs, making college more affordable, and protecting retirement benefits.

Jeff's "Fair Shot" Middle-Class Agenda

- Create good-paying jobs by investing in infrastructure, nurturing manufacturing, and ending tax breaks for corporations that ship jobs overseas.
- Level the playing field for American workers by ending China's unfair trade practices and holding them accountable for illegally manipulating their currency.
- End tax giveaways to Big Oil and invest in renewable energy.
- End the war in Afghanistan and invest the savings in education and infrastructure.
- Make college more affordable by giving students the same low interest rates on their loans as big banks, and let everyone refinance their student loans to take advantage of today's low rates.
- Protect a woman's right to choose and pass legislation ensuring equal pay for equal work.
- End LGBT workplace discrimination and fight for full equality for all.
- Protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Endorsed by: Planned Parenthood Action Fund, Basic Rights Oregon, Oregon Education Association, Oregon Nurses Association, Oregon State Fire Fighters Council, Oregon AFL-CIO

"Jeff Merkley has repeatedly led the fight to make college more affordable, to ban predatory mortgages, and to level the playing field for American manufacturing. I need him as a partner in the fight for Oregon jobs and Oregon values."

- U.S. Senator Ron Wyden

jeffmerkley.com

(This information furnished by Jeff Merkley for Oregon.)

US Senator

Christina Jean Lugo

Pacific Green

Occupation: Artist, Peace Activist

Occupational Background: Sole Proprietor, Green Hills Lawn and Garden

Educational Background:

University of Minnesota, Macalester College

Prior Governmental Experience: Secretary & Co Chair, Pacific Green Party

Vote for Peace

I am running for Federal office because I am a feminist who is opposed to war.

I oppose Senate Resolution 498 which supported the State of Israel during its widespread and massive bombing and shelling of Gaza. I could not support Senator Merkley as I watched hospitals and schools being bombed, families killed in their homes, mosques destroyed and hundreds of thousands of people made refugees in their own homeland.

While I condemn the rocket attacks of Hamas and acknowledge the special relationship the US and Israel have, I oppose \$3 billion in military aid to Israel. I decry the military industrial complex here in the United States, which spends \$640 billion annually on weapons of mass destruction and ongoing occupations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Democratic Party has failed to close Guantanamo Bay, failed to reign in the NSA, failed to sunset the Patriot Act and failed to make America safer, because both the Republicans and Democrats believe that America must maintain peace through fear, and the Greens believe that we have strength through peace.

Greens support a dramatic redirection of spending--away from war and towards peace. We support spending on jobs, education, healthcare and infrastructure. We are for climate justice, opposed to GMO's, we support women's rights and the rights of the planet. We are a progressive party that represents the healing, reconciling, peaceful future we all deserve.

Vote Green

www.christina4senate.org

By the way, if Ballot Measure 90 passes--the "Top Two" Primary proposition, it is unlikely that voters will see a point of view of any "third party" candidates in any future November election voters' guide. Please vote for diversity of values and opinion and Vote NO on Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Christina Lugo.)

US Senator

Monica Wehby

Republican

Occupation: Pediatric Neurosurgeon

Occupational Background: Pediatric Neurosurgeon, Director of Pediatric Neurosurgery, Randall Children's Hospital

1997-Present

Educational Background: B.S. University of Notre Dame; B.A. University of Notre Dame 1984; MD, Baylor College of Medicine, 1988; Neurosurgical Residency, UCLA Medical Center, 1995

Prior Governmental Experience: First time seeking political office

As a pediatric neurosurgeon, I have spent a lifetime dedicated to making a difference in the lives of others. So, it often surprises people to hear I am willing to leave a profession like that to run for public office. But, as a mother of four and a doctor of pediatrics, I have a concern our struggling economy, and massive debt are leading to fewer opportunities for the next generation of Oregonians.

Changing that path means changing the people we send to Washington. Career politicians aren't worried about Oregonians, but I am. I'm ready to use my skill set to bring opportunity back to Oregon.

Here's my plan to do it:

- **Fighting for Oregon Jobs**
 - Support lower taxes for all Oregonians
 - Fight to decrease excessive regulation
 - Install commonsense policies to jumpstart our economy
- **Protecting Oregon's Future**
 - Support a balanced budget amendment
 - Reduce our \$17 trillion debt
 - End corporate bailouts and cronyism
 - Promote and invest in better education
- **Fixing Our Healthcare**
 - Ensure people with pre-existing conditions have access to healthcare
 - Institute patient centered, market driven reforms.
 - Ensure people can pick the doctor they want, and the healthcare they need
- **Protecting Oregon Values**
 - Support a woman's right to choose
 - Defend marriage equality and the rights of all Oregonians
 - Protect our environment and the livelihoods relying on it

It's time we had a Senator willing to fight on the issues that matter most to Oregonians; someone who will work across party lines to get the job done, not continue the status quo. On these issues and more, you can count on me to do just that. I humbly ask for your support to represent you in the United States Senate.

(This information furnished by Dr. Monica Wehby for U.S. Senate.)

US Representative, 4th District



Art Robinson

Republican
Constitution

Occupation: Scientist;
Educator; Businessman

Occupational Background:
Faculty, UC San Diego;
President, Oregon Institute of

Science and Medicine

Educational Background: Caltech BS; UC San Diego PhD

Prior Governmental Experience: No government office.

My Promise to You

When my late wife, Laurelee, passed away from pancreatitis, I made a promise: To fight the disease that robbed my children of their mother, and to bring up our six children to make her proud.

Today I make a similar promise to *your* family:

- **Term Limits**

Career politicians have broken Washington. We need term limits for Congress, we must listen to working people rather than Big Money, and we must kick lobbyists out of law making. My first act will be setting a date to come back home to Oregon.

- **Jobs that Pay the Bills**

People who work hard and play by the rules shouldn't see their bills rise faster than their wages. We need to invest here in Oregon – and stop red tape and politics from getting in the way. The end of the month shouldn't mean bills and heartache.

- **For Oregon, For a Change**

Career politicians have put big donors ahead of bringing jobs to our community. Why do they only pay attention at election time? Oregon will always be my home, not Washington DC. Fighting for Oregon will be my first and last priority.

- **Teach to the Child, Not to the Test**

Washington DC thinks they know our children better than we do here in Oregon. Rather than testing our children, we should be inspiring them. Teachers know their students, and we need to approach each child as the unique individuals they are.

- **Pay Teachers More, Not Bureaucrats**

We need to take control away from overpaid bureaucrats and hand our schools back to local communities. We can pay teachers more and attract the best to inspire our children.

www.ArtForCongress.com

(This information furnished by Art Robinson for Congress.)

US Representative, 4th District



Peter A DeFazio

Democrat
Progressive
Working Families

Occupation: U.S.
Representative

Occupational Background:
Chair, Lane County

Commissioner, U.S. Air Force Reserve

Educational Background: Tufts University, University of Oregon

Prior Governmental Experience: Chair, Lane County Commission

CREATING JOBS FOR OREGONIANS

DeFazio has led the fight to increase investment in our crumbling transportation infrastructure that will create jobs for Oregonians, increase safety, and improve America's competitiveness. He supports water resource development legislation to improve our ports and bring jobs to Oregon's south coast.

"Rep. DeFazio secures millions of dollars in funding for small ports" *Drain Enterprise*, 5/22/14

"His passion should remind his colleagues about the government's indispensable role in supporting America's prosperity" *The World*, 3/10/13

FIGHTING FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

DeFazio has opposed every job-killing NAFTA-style "free trade" agreement. He backs "Buy America" provisions to ensure taxpayer dollars support American jobs and companies.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

DeFazio has fought to protect Social Security. He supports an improved annual cost of living adjustment and legislation to guarantee Trust Fund solvency by having the wealthiest millionaires pay the same rate into Social Security as the average American worker.

BALANCED BUDGET

DeFazio thinks that when members of Congress aren't doing their job, they shouldn't be paid. He voted for the **No Budget No Pay** law that stops congress from getting paid when they don't pass a budget. He also pushed for a bipartisan balanced budget amendment.

PAY RAISES TO SCHOLARSHIPS

DeFazio has voted against every congressional pay raise and, by the end of 2014, will have contributed \$378,000 of after-tax salary to fund 237 scholarships at Southwest Oregon community colleges and to reduce the national debt.

GMO LABELING STANDARDS

DeFazio believes Americans have the right to know what's in their food. He introduced legislation that would require clear labeling of genetically engineered foods.

DEFAZIO: AS INDEPENDENT AS OREGON

"DeFazio, an Oregon Democrat who has a history of breaking with his party's leadership when he feels it has compromised on tax fairness, economic justice and infrastructure investment." *The Nation*, 1/2/13

(This information furnished by DeFazio for Congress.)

US Representative, 4th District



Mike Beilstein

Pacific Green

Occupation: Chemist, retired

Occupational Background:
 1978 to 2007 – research chemist at Oregon State University;
 1977 to 1978 – research chemist, Johns Hopkins University;
 1976 to 1977 – research chemist,

Medical College of Virginia; 1973 to 1975 – US Peace Corps, teacher in Lesotho, Southern Africa

Educational Background: MA (1989), home economics, Oregon State University; BA (1973), biochemistry, Oregon State University

Prior Governmental Experience: Corvallis City Council, 1999-2000, 2007-2014

We are far over the “safe” target of 350 ppm atmospheric carbon dioxide. Producers and consumers need to start paying for the environmental costs of dumping CO2 into the air. The “carbon fee and dividend” approach will internalize the costs of CO2 pollution, and create incentives for appropriate energy technology. This is a practical GREEN solution to a civilization threatening problem.

The **PACIFIC GREEN PARTY** is not about protest or radical environmentalism. It is about practical solutions that benefit everyone in creating a sustainable and just global society.


- **Stop using the military** to enrich oil companies at the cost of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars.
- **Single payer national health system.** Comprehensive community based care.
- **Fund education** that develops our full potential. Eliminate tuition. Forgive student debt.
- **Expand rail and transit.** De-emphasizes the automobile.
- **Decriminalize drug use.** Provide appropriate medical treatment for addicts.
- **Eliminate arms exports** that fuel global violence.
- **Support the right of all workers to organize.** \$15 per hour minimum wage. Stop trading with countries that practice slavery. Full human rights and labor rights for immigrant workers.
- **Protect Oregon forests.** No give-aways to lumber barons. Protect federal and state forests to ensure endangered salmon recovery and clean drinking water.
- **Enforce environmental and safety rules.** End the ecological disasters created by fossil fuel companies. No fracking. No mountaintop removal coal mining.
- **Build an economy** that meets human needs. Help the wealthy re-invest in a better society for all.

Vote Peace! Vote Green!


(This information furnished by Mike Beilstein.)

Complete your ballot

Carefully read and follow all instructions printed on your ballot.



To vote, completely fill in the oval next to your choice.



To write-in a candidate:


→ Clearly print his or her name on the dotted line provided on the ballot

-and-

→ Fill in the oval next to the name you wrote-in

Check for errors

You do not have to vote on all contests. Those you do vote on will still count.



If you vote for more than one option, your vote **will not count** for that candidate or measure.



Check your ballot carefully

You can not change your vote after you have returned your ballot

Contact your County Elections Office or call **1 866 673 VOTE** to request a replacement ballot if:

- you make a mistake
- you lose your ballot
- your ballot is damaged or spoiled
- or for any other reason.

Governor



Dennis Richardson

Republican
Independent

Occupation: Businessman;
State Representative

Occupational Background:
U.S. Army combat helicopter
pilot, Vietnam; Small Business

Owner; Attorney

Educational Background: BYU, J. Reuben Clark Law School

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon House of Representatives, Speaker Pro Tem, Co-Chair of Ways & Means Committee; City Councilor; School District Budget Committee Chairman

Community Service: Boy Scout and church youth leader; volunteer soccer coach; veteran

Oregonians,

Voters across the state are **rightly disappointed with the expensive failures of John Kitzhaber's aloof and largely absent third term.**

Under John Kitzhaber, Oregon has recently **lost thousands of jobs, wasted \$300 million dollars on Cover Oregon** without a single person enrolling online, and wasted another **\$190 million on the Columbia River Crossing** - a bridge that never got built. Our state ranks **49th in the country for high school graduation rates** and our kids are leaving to seek prosperity elsewhere.

Oregon news outlets report that **Governor Kitzhaber chooses to pay women just 79 cents on the dollar** compared to their male counterparts. This inequality must stop immediately.

With attentive and accountable leadership, we can **return Oregon to prosperity**. As your next governor, I will put an end to cronyism, take personal responsibility for state projects, and **lead a government focused more on protecting your job than mine.**

I promise to run the first Administration in Oregon history that pays women and men equally.

I will demand the legislature fund K-12 Education before any other program, and I will work tirelessly to make sure every Oregonian has the opportunity for a full-time job. I won't let up until the next generation of Oregonians has the same educational opportunities my kids had.

I have a plan to get Oregon working again.

Please visit www.DennisRichardson.com/reboot to learn how we can ignite Oregon's economy, provide our children with a world-class education, reform dysfunctional state government at every level and make sure Oregon women receive equal pay for equal work.

Together we can do this!

Sincerely,

Dennis Richardson

(This information furnished by Citizens To Elect Dennis Richardson.)

Governor



Aaron Auer

Constitution

Occupation: Circuit Rider,
Minister of the Gospel

Occupational Background:
Self-employed, Pioneering
Pastor

Educational Background:

Rhema Bible Training Center

Prior Governmental Experience: None

REVIVING OUR STATE'S SOVEREIGN RIGHTS AND YOUR PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION

I was raised on the Auer Jersey Farm which produced the highest quality raw milk in Oregon. A high standard work ethic was exemplified by my family. Honor and patriotism took root in my heart and soul at a young age. I will defend our hardworking Oregonian's land, sovereign rights, and private property.

HONORING OUR HEROIC VETERANS AND PRESERVING OUR RICH HERITAGE

At our State Capitol grounds stands two living memorials: The Circuit Rider and Jason Lee Statue with Bible and petition in hand. These landmarks have been set; never to be replaced or removed. If we do not fight to keep the knowledge of our heritage we will lose the blessing of the LORD on our great state. I will endeavor to honor and preserve the Native American's quest for the Book of Heaven.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION, SPEECH, AND THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

Oregon's Organic Law of the Provisional Government stated, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary for good government. Article 1, Section 2 and 3 of Oregon State Constitution reads, "All men shall be secured in their natural right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions or interfere with the right of conscience."

SANCTITY OF LIFE AND MARRIAGE

We are all created in the Creator's image; therefore, the unalienable rights of the unborn is the first duty of civil government. Human life is sacred. Male and female created He them. For this cause shall a man leave his Father and his Mother and shall cleave unto his wife.

VOTE FOR AARON AUER FOR GOVERNOR: OREGON'S
PREACHING STATESMAN

For information contact: www.constitutionpartyoregon.org

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT

(This information furnished by Aaron Auer.)

Governor



John Kitzhaber

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: Governor of Oregon

Occupational Background: Emergency Room Physician

Educational Background:

South Eugene High School, 1965; B.A. Dartmouth College, 1969; M.D. University of Oregon Medical School, 1973

Prior Governmental Experience: Governor 2011-present, 1995-2003; Senate President 1985-1993; State Senator 1981-1993; State Representative 1979-1981

John Kitzhaber

As an emergency room doctor in rural Oregon, legislator, governor and father, John Kitzhaber has delivered for Oregon workers, seniors and children.

A strong vision for Oregon's future

- Fighting to rebuild a strong, secure middle class by helping small businesses grow and by delivering the right kind of jobs – good-paying jobs with benefits
- Revamping workforce training to better prepare Oregonians with the skills they need for 21st century jobs
- Creating new jobs in rural Oregon in forest management and wildlife habitat protection while producing a reliable supply of timber

Working across party lines to get things done

- Boosting investment in early reading skills through third grade so more children graduate ready to succeed
- Reforming the state's public employee retirement system to save millions
- Restoring lost school days and hiring teachers while demanding accountability for key outcomes like high school graduation rates
- Coordinating state healthcare services to reduce waste, cut costs, improve quality and expand preventive care
- Adding over 100,000 jobs and reducing unemployment
- Freezing tuition at Oregon's community colleges and universities for the first time in 14 years

A leader we can trust

John Kitzhaber has stayed true to his values, taken tough stands, and delivered for Oregonians. That's why he's been endorsed by thousands of Oregonians, including:

- Oregon Business Association
- Oregon League of Conservation Voters
SEIU 503 & 49
- Oregon Nurses Association
- Oregon AFL-CIO
- American Federation of Teachers-Oregon (AFT-Oregon)
- Oregon AFSCME
- Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council
- Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC
- Oregon State Council for Retired Citizens
- Planned Parenthood PAC
- NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon PAC

(This information furnished by Kitzhaber for Governor.)



Ballots must be received by 8pm on November 4

County Elections Offices are open on election day from 7am to 8pm



A postmark does not make a ballot "received."

To guarantee that your ballot is received by the deadline, return it to an official dropsite.

for more information about voting in Oregon

oregonvotes.gov



1 866 673 VOTE / 1 866 673 8683
se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

State Senator, 6th District**Lee Beyer**

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: Senator / Retired

Occupational Background:
Occupation: Chairman, Oregon
Public Utility Commission;
Development Executive; Small

Business Consultant & Advocate; Management Analyst;
Vocational/Professional Training Administrator; Millworker;
U.S. Air Force

Educational Background: University of Oregon, B.A.
Management

Prior Governmental Experience: PUC; State Senator &
Representative; Springfield City Council, Budget and Planning
Commission; Willamalane Park Board

Community Experience: McKenzie-Willamette Hospital
Board; Convention & Visitor Bureau Board; LCC Technical/
Professional Advisory Council; Linn-Benton-Lane Regional
Strategy Board; Springfield Education Foundation; Scout
Leader; Soccer Coach.

LEE BEYER: A Record of Experience and Commitment

You can count on **Senator Beyer** to:

- Make Sure that Oregon is open for business and job creation
- Ensure women receive equal pay
- Slow skyrocketing increases in college tuition
- Help make childcare more affordable for working families
- Work to slow the growth of health care costs

Dear Neighbors:

Four years ago you elected me to the State Senate to help create economic opportunity, to fight for better schools, to support our state universities and community colleges, and to keep our families safe. I'm proud of the progress we've made, but there is much more to do.

It's critical that we get Oregon's economy on track and people back to work. That's why fostering job growth, business investment, and infrastructure improvement has been -- and will remain -- my top priority. And, because education is the key to a bright future for our kids and our community, I will continue to fight hard to restore funding for our schools, to reduce class sizes, and hire more well-qualified teachers.

It's been an honor and a privilege to work on your behalf. With your support, we can continue to make Oregon a great place to live, work and do business. I respectfully ask for your vote. -**Lee Beyer**

Endorsed By:

Oregon Education Association

Oregon State Police Officers Association

Oregon AFL-CIO

Oregon Farm Bureau

Oregon Fire Fighters Council

Oregon Building and Construction Trades Council

Oregon League of Conservation Voters

www.VoteLeeBeyer.com

(541) 746-5889

(This information furnished by Friends of Lee Beyer.)

State Senator, 6th District**Michael P Spasaro**

Republican
Libertarian

Occupation: Educator; Retired
Law Enforcement

Occupational Background:
US Army, 3 years; Local and
Federal Law Enforcement, 32

years; Diplomatic Service, 6 years; Educator, 10 years

Educational Background: Florida Atlantic University, BA

Prior Governmental Experience: Board of the Linn County
Commission on Families and Children, 10 years; Lebanon
School Budget Committee; Lebanon School Site Committee

Community: Board Chair of a Lane County non-profit facility
providing substance abuse recovery support, Boy Scouts of
America, Eugene-Springfield Prevention Coalition

Strong Community-Based Leadership

Michael's compassion for our community is rooted in his service to others. "I believe the people of this area know what is best for them. My job is to represent **their** interests."

As State Senator, Michael Spasaro's priorities will be:

Caring for our families

- Focus on putting resources and local control into the classroom.
- Ensure that healthcare is affordable and accessible.
- Recognize the sacrifices of our Veterans.

Strengthening our Communities

- Focus on ways to support local business and to create new jobs.
- To fully fund Public Safety.
- Prioritize services to our seniors and vulnerable citizens.
- Responsible utilization of our natural resources and healthy forests.

Restoring Government Accountability

"It is critical to balance our priorities and stop wasteful government spending, such as the failed Cover Oregon website. We must hold our leaders accountable.

Our founding fathers envisioned citizen legislators - not career politicians whose campaigns are funded by special interest groups and big industry. We have deviated so far from this vision. Is it any wonder our government has become so dysfunctional?

Decades of electing politicians, rather than actual representatives of the people, have silenced Oregonians who are governed by out of touch politicians. I pledge to be your voice in Salem.

I am not beholden to any political or special interest group. My only allegiance is to you, our children, and future generations."
- Michael P. Spasaro

Michael Spasaro "getting Oregon back on track"!

www.michaelspasaro.com

(This information furnished by Friends of Michael P. Spasaro.)

State Senator, 8th District



Betsy L. Close

Republican
Libertarian

Occupation: Oregon Senator

Occupational Background: Teacher, South Albany High School and North Albany Middle School; OSU Graduate

Teaching Assistant; Benton County Job Developer

Educational Background: MS, Oregon State University; BA, Central Washington University; BA, Washington State University

Prior Governmental Experience: State Representative; Oregon Commission for Women; Oregon Hunger Task Force; Albany School Committee

Personal: Married 42 years, 4 children, 1 grandchild

Betsy Close

**Accessible, Transparent, Bipartisan
Standing Up for the Middle Class**

As teacher, job developer, and Benton County resident nearly four decades, Betsy taught skills and arranged on-the-job-training to give disadvantaged youth a hand up.

"Betsy Close has the **experience and compassion to serve our community** and bring prosperity to working families. Betsy deserves your trust."

—Frank Morse, Former State Senator

Education First

"Betsy Close understands the importance of a high-quality education, having taught at South Albany High School and North Albany Middle School. Betsy's **bipartisan work resulted in the largest education funding boost in Oregon history**. Her support for higher education **prevented OSU tuition hikes in 2014-2015**."

—Anna Marie Gosser, Corvallis Teacher

Family Wage Jobs

"Betsy Close worked to **expand technical education and form public-private partnerships with local businesses to train workers**. She understands the needs of small businesses and supports local farmers."

—Dawsen Koos, Fifth-Generation Albany Farmer

Public Safety

"Betsy Close is the only candidate who consistently voted to protect our families from violent criminals. She led a bipartisan coalition **cracking down on sex traffickers that exploit young girls**."

—Tim Mueller, Retired Linn County Sheriff

Protecting Seniors and Women

"Betsy Close is the only candidate who voted to **protect seniors' retirements**. She supports equal pay for women in the workforce and helped hungry Oregonians and food banks obtain local, farm-fresh food."

—Jean Petersen, Corvallis Senior

Efficiency and Accountability

"Betsy Close is a **bipartisan leader** who ensures taxpayers' hard-earned dollars are used wisely."

—Andy Olson, State Representative

Vote Betsy Close

www.betsyclose.com

(This information furnished by Betsy Close.)

State Senator, 8th District



Sara A. Gelser

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: State Representative

Occupational Background: Children with Disabilities and Family Support Coordinator,

Oregon DHS; Instructor, LBCC; Regional Coordinator, Oregon Parent Training and Information Center

Educational Background: MAIS, Oregon State University; BA, Earlham College

Prior Governmental Experience: Corvallis School Board

Quality schools

As a mother of four public school students and former school board member, Sara knows we need to invest in good teachers to reduce class sizes. She pushed for \$1 billion in additional funding for K-12 schools and worked across the aisle to secure resources for projects at LBCC and OSU.

Freezing college tuition

Sara saw too many families struggling with skyrocketing college costs. That's why she voted to freeze tuition for Oregon students so young people can graduate without crippling debt.

Small business

Sara believes we need an economy that works for working people and small businesses, not just big corporations. She championed legislation to protect jobs in our \$50 million specialty seed industry and made it easier for small businesses to access the capital they need to grow and create more jobs.

Pro-choice leader

Sara is a pro-choice leader who has protected access to reproductive health care and emergency contraception for ALL Oregon women.

Safer communities

Sara toughened Oregon's rape laws. She spearheaded Karly's Law to ensure abused children get immediate access to the medical care they need.

Family-wage jobs

Sara is working to create family-wage jobs in Oregon. She has fought to build vital transportation projects and education facilities in our community, get shop classes back in schools, and invest in community colleges so Oregon's workers have the skills to get good jobs. Sara supports equal pay for women and ensuring workers can earn paid sick days.

ENDORSED BY:

Oregon End Violence Against Women PAC
Sheriff Scott Jackson

Oregon Council of Police Associations

Oregon State Fire Fighters Council

Basic Rights Oregon Equality PAC

Oregon Education Association

Oregon Steelworkers Legislative Committee

SEIU 503

Oregon League of Conservation Voters

Planned Parenthood PAC

www.saragelser.com

(This information furnished by Sara Gelser for State Senate.)

State Representative, 11th District

Andy Petersen

Republican

Occupation: Rancher; Tree Farmer; Small Business Owner

Occupational Background: Accounting & Finance Officer and Budget Officer, United States Air Force; Information Management & Liaison Officer,

United States Air Force Reserve

Educational Background: BS in Financial Management, Oregon State University; MA in Public Administration, Troy State University

Prior Governmental Experience: United States Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency County Committee 2005-2013; Camp Creek Elementary Site Council 1999-2003

Caring for our Community – Working for Oregon

Like you, Andy has invested in our community for years. Andy clearly sees and understands our needs from Shedd to South Eugene. Andy stands by his promises and you can stand with him. **Elect Andy as your Representative** for House District 11 to have a government official who listens to you.

Education and Core Services

We know, as Andy does, that our school system can be number one. Andy has the will, knowledge, determination and ethics to do the right thing for our kids and schools. We can protect education funding and school choice for students and families by voting for a solid citizen like Andy. **Elect Andy as your Representative** and Andy will put our schools back on course.

Opportunity and Accountability

We can have a thriving economy and the ability to provide basic services to our community. Responsible government spending and restrained bureaucracy mean that everyone can realize the dignity of having a good job that pays fair wages or can open a small business. **Elect Andy as your Representative** and these future opportunities will not be lost.

Natural Resources and Safe Food

Andy has spent a lifetime responsibly managing natural resources. Andy knows we can find a solution to feed our growing population and provide safe and nutritious food for our children.

"I care about you and believe Oregon can do better. I would be honored to represent you in Salem." *Andy Petersen*

[Vote ANDY PETERSEN on your ballot.](http://www.andypetersen.com)

www.andypetersen.com

(This information furnished by Andrew Petersen For Oregon.)

State Representative, 11th District

Phil Barnhart

Democrat
Working Families

Occupation: State Representative

Occupational Background: Clinical Psychologist; Adjunct Professor, University of Oregon; Deputy District Attorney; Attorney

Educational Background: University of Oregon, BA, JD; California School of Professional Psychology, PhD. South Eugene High School.

Prior Governmental Experience: Seven-Term State Representative; Eugene School Board; Board of Psychologist Examiners; Deputy District Attorney

TOGETHER WE CAN BUILD A PROSPEROUS OREGON

As a leader in Oregon's Legislature, Phil Barnhart has delivered for working families in Oregon.

As Chair of the House Revenue Committee, Phil is fighting to eliminate millions of dollars in loopholes and corporate giveaways to fund education, public safety, and other essential services. He is a proven leader, stimulating the economy, protecting Oregon's most vulnerable, and creating a fairer and balanced tax structure.

Promoting Job Growth

Phil works tirelessly to stimulate jobs and give businesses extra support. Phil passed numerous bills to help small businesses put Oregonians back to work. Phil devoted countless hours to stabilize and reform our renewable energy industry to keep Oregon at the forefront of the energy revolution, and he boosted funding for career and technical education programs to get people ready to work.

Supporting Struggling Families

Phil championed legislation to protect our children's education and services for families when they need them most. He supported extending unemployment benefits to workers who have been hardest hit by the economic downturn. He fought to keep people in their homes and hold out-of-state banks accountable in the foreclosure crisis. He kept thousands of senior citizens in their homes by protecting and expanding their homestead tax deferral.

Delivering Results for Students

Phil delivered better results for all students and worked to make higher education more affordable and accessible. Phil voted to create Summer Learning Grants to fund programs that will add at least 60 hours of learning time for students at high-poverty, low-performing schools and pioneered a tuition-free 'Pay it Forward' program that could save future students from crushing debt.

Vote for Phil Barnhart, State Representative.

(This information furnished by Friends of Phil Barnhart.)

State Representative, 15th District



Andy Olson

Republican
Democrat
Independent

Occupation:
State Representative

Occupational Background:
Oregon State Police, 29

Years; Community College Instructor; Emergency Services Consultant

Educational Background: Bachelors, George Fox University; Associates, Chemeketa Community College

Prior Governmental Experience: Oregon State Police; State Representative

ANDY OLSON; EXPERIENCED AND EFFECTIVE

"I have known Andy for 25 plus years. During that time period, he has always been responsive and supportive of law enforcement needs. He is a man of his word and has my full support." **Bruce Riley, Linn County Sheriff**

"I want to thank Andy Olson for supporting creative ways to improve the business environment and encourage job growth for a better economy in Oregon." **Janet Steele, President of the Albany Chamber of Commerce**

"When we had serious problems with the state, Andy listened intently to what we had to say, did his research and acted quickly, getting assistance for our family. We have such a sense of security knowing his door is always open to anyone who needs his help." **Jim and LaDonna Pollard, Registered Voters**

"Andy never loses sight of what is important to our community. He continues to bring leadership, experience, and compassion to Salem as he represents our district with a servant's heart." **Roger Nyquist, Linn County Commissioner**

"Education is vital to the success of Oregon's future. Andy Olson is passionate for education excellence on behalf of students, parents, educators and the greater community. He is also concerned about the welfare of our students. He has my support." **Susie Orsborn, Principal West Albany High School**

ANDY OLSON; WORKING FOR YOU

- **Grow JOBS and continue to reduce unemployment**, creating long-term economic strength by supporting Oregon businesses. The Government must be a stepping stone, not a stumbling block for businesses.
- **Fund education** with adequate, stable, and accountable dollars for K-12 classrooms, community colleges and universities.
- **Use taxpayer dollars wisely** by prioritizing spending and balancing budgets.
- **Strengthen and support the criminal justice** system for safe communities and overall security through wise policy.

WWW.FRIENDSOFANDYOLSON.COM

(This information furnished by Friends of Andy Olson.)



View unofficial election results

starting at 8pm on November 4

vote!

www.oregonvotes.gov

for more information about voting in Oregon

↑ oregonvotes.gov



1 866 673 VOTE / 1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

State Representative, 17th District

Rich Harisay

Democrat

No photo submitted

Occupation: Organic Farmer

Occupational Background: Insurance Agent for Phoenix Mutual Life --- Owner and CEO of Benefit Designs, Inc. -- Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) for Marion County

Juvenile Court -- CoFounder of Marion Polk Move To Amend

Educational Background: Brigham Young University, B.S. in Psychology and Biology; San Jose State University, Graduate Work in School Psychology; The Teaching Company Great Courses, World and American History

Prior Governmental Experience: None

I am a small d democrat

I believe as stated in both the State and Federal Constitutions

That the People Are Sovereign

That the People (only) have the right to set Government Policy.

Artificial Entities (Corporations) have stolen your Sovereignty and Rights.

Right here in Oregon ALEC has bought 19 of our Legislators

ALEC is supported by and represents the interests of

The KOCH BROTHERS (the 1%ers who invented **flamable drinking water**)

My opponent is a member of ALEC.

I have worked since 2009 to rid our electoral system of Corporate Money and Influence.

more information at: richharisay.org

(This information furnished by Richard Harisay.)

State Representative, 17th District



Sherrie Sprenger

Republican
Libertarian

Occupation: State Representative

Occupational Background: Benton and Grant County Deputy Sheriff; Small Business Owner

Educational Background: BS-Management and Communications, Corban University

Prior Governmental Experience: Lebanon Community School Board and Chair; Fair Dismissal Appeals Board, Governor's Appointment; Linn County Compensation Board, Commissioner's Appointment

Community Service: School Volunteer; New Hope Pregnancy Center; Legislative Policy Committee; Oregon School Boards Association; Sunday School Teacher

REPRESENTATIVE SHERRIE SPRENGER: OUR VALUES

Representative Sherrie Sprenger stands strong for our values and works hard to deliver results for our families and rural communities.

- **JOBS AND THE ECONOMY:** Reduce burdensome regulation and red tape, create incentives for our small businesses to grow and hire our neighbors
- **EDUCATION:** Fully fund our schools and give teachers flexibility in the classroom
- **PUBLIC SAFETY:** Secure funding for rural public safety
- **COMMONSENSE BUDGETING:** Eliminate government waste and inefficiency, streamline agencies for better service

REPRESENTATIVE SHERRIE SPRENGER: OUR VOICE

Our district benefits from Representative Sprenger's experience, leadership and commonsense solutions.

- **EMPOWERING LOCAL SCHOOLS:** After two years and a Governor's veto, Representative Sprenger got a bill passed that allows school board to enter into agreements with Native American tribes for the use of mascots that represent them. Representative Sprenger has met with school boards and tribe members across the state to work together on these agreements.
- **ENSURING QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR RURAL OREGON:** Representative Sprenger ensured that money was allocated for medical students serving in rural areas to have a portion of their student loans forgiven.
- **PROTECTING VULNERABLE YOUTH:** Representative Sprenger sponsored and got a bill passed to improve services for vulnerable young Oregonians through the Youth Suicide Intervention and Prevention Coordinator.

REPRESENTATIVE SHERRIE SPRENGER: ENDORSEMENTS

- National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB/Oregon)
- Sheriffs of Oregon PAC
- Taxpayers Association of Oregon PAC
- Oregon Small Business Coalition

RE-ELECT REPRESENTATIVE SHERRIE SPRENGER. OUR VALUES. OUR VOICE.

SherrieSprenger.com

(This information furnished by Sherrie Sprenger.)

County Commissioner, Linn County, Position 1

John K Lindsey

Republican
Democrat

Occupation: County
Commissioner

Occupational Background:
Business Owner, Refrigeration,
U.S. Military

Educational Background: Attended Lebanon Union High School as a Warrior, Linn Benton Community College, Oregon State University

Prior Governmental Experience: Selective Service Board, Chairman of the Linn County Extension District, Has served on several State and Federal advisory commissions in the area of forestry and land use. United States Navy, Oregon National Guard.

JOHN LINDSEY has worked over his years as a Linn County Commissioner to serve the people of Linn County as priority number one. This has allowed Linn County to be leader in job creation and economic development.

JOHN LINDSEY has worked to make public safety and law enforcement a top priority. Without a safe environment for our citizens there can be no strong communities.

JOHN LINDSEY has been a strong voice and advocate for our veteran communities. John has authored legislation to help our men and women who have served.

"I want to thank the citizens of Linn County for allowing me to serve you over the previous years. It has been my honor to serve as your county commissioner. As we navigate our way through these times of growing distrust of our government institutions nationally, I thank the voters for electing me in both the Republican and Democrat primaries. I take great pride that the Linn County Board of Commissioners have worked hard to serve all of Linn County in a fair manner. I will continue defending you and protecting as much as I can of the freedoms and liberties we have. Our country, state and county are tremendous gifts passed onto us, I ask for your vote of confidence this November." - John Lindsey

(This information furnished by John Lindsey.)

Judge of the Circuit Court, 23rd District, Position 2



David E Delsman

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Circuit Judge, 23rd Judicial District, Linn County, 2013 - present

Occupational Background: Circuit Judge, Trial Attorney for 20 years, including Civil Litigation, Criminal Trials,

Family Law, Probate, and Appeals.

Educational Background: University of Oregon School of Law, Juris Doctor, 1992; University of Oregon, Bachelor of Science (Political Science and Economics) 1988; Dallas High School, Dallas Oregon.

Prior Governmental Experience: Member, Oregon Department of Justice Attorney General’s Task Force on Victims’ Rights Enforcement; Judge; Intern, Oregon House of Representatives; Intern, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Eugene

Commitment to Community

Dave Delsman has lived, worked and been involved in Linn County for over 20 years. He has been married to his wife Kathleen for 21 years. They have two sons, Ben and Alex.

Community Service

- Linn County Mediation Services, Board Member
- Classroom Law Project
 - West Albany High School Mock Trial Coach
 - Regional Coordinator - Albany Regional Competition
- Boy Scouts of America - Calapooia District and Troop 99 Albany
- St. Mary’s School Advisory Committee

Experience

Dave Delsman has worked as a lawyer and judge for over 20 years. His life experience, legal expertise, and even temperament make him well-suited to serve as judge. He is well-respected by the legal community and by those who work with the courts. He is committed to serving Linn County and believes that every person appearing in court should be treated with respect, patience and fairness.

Personal Statement

It has been an honor to serve as a Circuit Judge and I look forward to the opportunity of serving in the future. I appreciate your vote.

(This information furnished by Committee to Elect Dave Delsman.)

County Sheriff, Linn County



Bruce Riley

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Linn County Sheriff

Occupational Background: Linn County Sheriff’s Office 1985 – Present; 1985 – 1987 Reserve Deputy; 1987 – 1994 Patrol Deputy to include two

years as the Sheriff’s Office first D.A.R.E. Officer; 1994 – 1998 Patrol Corporal; 1998 – 2005 Patrol 1st Sergeant; 2005 – 2009 Captain of the Patrol Division; 2009 – 2013 Undersheriff; January 2014 – Present, Linn County Sheriff.

Educational Background: FBI National Academy, Quantico Virginia; FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development, Quantico Virginia; Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards & Training: Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Supervisory, Middle Management & Executive certifications in both Police and Corrections; Oregon State Sheriff’s Association Sheriff’s Institute; Associate of Science Degree in Criminal Justice, LBCC; Salem Academy High School.

Prior Governmental Experience: Linn County Sheriff; Linn County Public Safety Coordinating Council; Tangent Rural Fire Protection District Board of Directors.

Sheriff Riley – Proven Law Enforcement Leader

Accomplishments as your Sheriff: Helped secure funding for the Sheriff’s Office for the next four years with the recent passage of our Law Enforcement Levy. This allows us to continue 24-hour patrols and reopen an additional 48 jail beds. Put into operation “Focused Patrols” to target high crime areas. Acquired supervision and operation of Linn County Dog Control and reinstated our Citizens Academy.

Citizens of Linn County: I am a life-long resident of Linn County and consider it an excellent place to live and raise a family. As your Sheriff, I am committed to keeping the peace with **dignity, honesty and compassion.**


Personal service is unique to my office. You will always connect to a live person when calling my office and a deputy will respond to your home if requested. I believe having a jail bed available is a great deterrent to crime.

Finally, you have entrusted me with the funding to operate a full-service law enforcement agency. I will continue to do that with honor, accountability and transparency.

Please vote to keep Sheriff Riley working as your Sheriff!

(This information furnished by Bruce W. Riley.)

Mayor, City of Albany



Jim Clausen

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Machinist/
programmer/fixture design

Occupational Background:
Machinist, Department lead,
Real Estate - stressing accu-
rate outcomes and customer
interaction.

Educational Background: Bellflower High - diploma

Prior Governmental Experience: Americans for Prosperity - Chapter chair for grassroots government education group. Petition coordinator - Coordinating gathering of signatures for local debt control petition. Attended most City Council meetings in last 4 years, speaking often.

Accountability. Accountability is what our city lacks. Accountability is what our city needs.

Water/sewer rates continue to rise. Water/sewer rates rose approximately 6% this year. The city plans to do this every year for the next 6 years meaning bills could double. People traveling back and forth tell me they pay less for water in the desert state of Arizona. Why? Because Albany has no accountability built into the system. I'll work to stop the rapid growth of water/sewer rates.

We were asked to approve a \$20 million Police/Fire Station bond - without seeing plans. Blind voting - we have to "pass it to see what's in it". I'll change that. I'll work to make sure buildings meet basic needs instead of becoming monuments to past officials.

Millions have been spent on urban renewal, yet a short walk downtown shows many vacant commercial properties. The present Mayor brags about urban renewal creating jobs - yet the only evidence of any real job created was the urban renewal director job - at total approximate cost \$250,000/yr.

We need an agreed upon list of essential City functions and consider which non-essentials to stop funding. We should adopt the practice of determining ACTUAL costs for essential City services like water/sewer. Present practice has resulted in ever increasing costs of local governance.

Those in office now appear blind to ever increasing costs. We can't fix these problems without being able to see them. I'll work to stop the upward spiral.

I see the issues and I'll work on solutions. Tough decisions need to be made. I'll help the Council make those tough decisions.

(This information furnished by Jim Clausen.)

Mayor, City of Albany



Sharon Konopa

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Mayor of Albany

Occupational Background:
Event coordinator; small busi-
ness owner

Educational Background:
South Albany High School

diploma

Prior Governmental Experience: • Mayor of Albany; January 2009-present • Albany City Councilor; January 1997-Dec. 2008 • Oregon Passenger Rail Leadership Council; appointed by the Governor, 2011-present • Willamette Criminal Justice Council; board member-present • Central Albany Revitalization Area Board and Agency; 2001-present and former Chair of Agency • Cascade West Council of Governments; serving Senior/ Disability Services, Meals on Wheels, Loan Program Advisory Committee—16 year board member and executive committee • Mayor's Business Ready Task Force; adopted • Community Development Commission, 2013-present • Linn County Ten-Year Homeless Plan; Past Committee Co-chair, current update committee • Numerous committees/task forces-check out her web site for more information.

Government- Partnered Organizations:

- Albany Millersburg Economic Development Corporation; board member
- Albany Downtown Association; liaison board member
- Albany Partnership for Housing and Community Development; board member and executive committee

Sharon Konopa has diligently worked hard to support Albany's economy and during the nation's worst economic downturn. She kept Albany moving forward as a vibrant community with new jobs, businesses and great places to visit like Talking Water Gardens.

Sharon Konopa is very devoted in promoting Albany for visitors to enjoy and the results are tourism revenue is the highest amount in Albany's history.

Currently Sharon Konopa is Mayor of Albany and is a full time community volunteer. She has devoted for many years her time and energies for the citizens of Albany.

Have you ever noticed that most political candidates run their campaign on promises, and seem to say about the same thing? Sharon Konopa is not your usual candidate. She runs her campaign on what she has accomplished, and she has an 18 year record to prove it.


"Thank you Albany voters for your years of support in helping me make Albany a great place to live"....Sharon Konopa

Learn more about her experience and accomplishments at:

www.sharonkonopa.org

(This information furnished by Albany Friends of Sharon Konopa.)

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward I - A



Dick Olsen

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Retired

Occupational Background: Chemical Engineer at Fed. Bureau of Mines Albany Research Center

Educational Background: BA Pacific Lutheran U, PhD. Oregon State U.

Prior Governmental Experience: Albany Councilman 1973 to '76,- '77 to '78,- Albany Mayor '79 to '80,- Albany Councilman 1999 to 2002,-'03 to '06,- '07 to '10, -'11 to present.

When things need doing, Olsen gets after them:

Neighborhood rezoned from apartment house to single family.	'71
Downtown Carnegie Library (built 1914) kept open.	'73
Historic Monteith House built in 1849) bought by City and preserved.	'74
Prevented urban renewal, designed to demolish & redevelop downtown.	'79
Ambulance service returned to its rightful place in City Fire Department.	'79
Three downtown historic districts formed.	'80
Central School (built in 1915) preserved from demolition.	'80
Carnegie Library again kept open and endowment fund initiated.	'90
Swanson Pool rebuilt and reopened as Cool Water Park.	'05
Central School again saved from demolition.	'05
Restoration of Carnegie Library nearing completion.	'14

These accomplishments helped keep Albany the unique, enjoyable place it is today.

Whats Important?

Great Neighborhoods: The City initiated a study to get your advice on city planning. I suggested the study be called "Great Neighborhoods". I support revisiting the Great Neighborhoods project to get your input. **I believe we need grocery stores at the "Ray's" location in N. Albany and at the old Safeway location at Queen and Pacific.**

Zoning: Single family neighborhoods should be zoned as such. **I always advocate for single family zoning in single family neighborhoods.**

Urban renewal: Urban renewal has done great things for Downtown along first street. **Its time to be done with moratoriums and get going with the rest of the program.**

Representation: Downtown Albany and the CARA Urban Renewal District should have at least one member who lives downtown. **I'm it. Vote Olsen for City Council.**

I want to hear your concerns. Email me at rsolsen@proaxis.com or visit my website at www.dickolsenforalbanycitycouncil.com.

(This information furnished by Committee to Elect Dick Olsen.)

City Councilor, City of Albany, Ward II - A



Ray Kopczynski

Nonpartisan

Occupation: Employment Advisor: Community Services Consortium

Occupational Background: ~23 years managing JCPenney stores and departments - including downtown Albany

and Lebanon. 5+ years owning & managing Computer Renaissance store in Corvallis. 18 months working for a "dot-com-that-went-dot-bomb." 13 years working for Community Services Consortium in the Albany, Corvallis, & Newport offices.

Educational Background: Graduated from Corvallis High in 1966, 1 year @ OSU

Prior Governmental Experience: 3+ years as current City Councilor for Ward II-A -replacing Ralph Reid; 6+ years on Central Albany Revitalization Area Advisory Board

- Veteran, Army Security Agency - 1967-1971
- Vice President of the Vintage Saab Club of North America @ <http://vscna.org>

Community Involvement:

Albany Visitor Association liaison for City of Albany; Several years [prior] on Albany Chamber of Commerce Government Affairs Committee

I BELIEVE:

- **Albany has improved** dramatically over the past few years in comparison to other cities in Oregon.
- **Albany has an excellent (and enviable) financial record** that has consistently gotten high marks for accuracy and transparency!
- **Albany's professional staff** is of the highest caliber - in all departments.
- **Albany is a better place to live** with multiple endeavors via the Central Albany Revitalization Urban Renewal program. **I very strongly support the concept of Urban Renewal.**
- **I value the opportunity** to have input at all levels of City Government.
- **Your opinion** is 100% as valuable as mine...!

Personal Info:

- Married 43 years
- I have lived in the same Ward-II home in Albany since fall of 1995
- Very heavily involved with various clubs around vintage Saabs (The "2-digit Swede") Ask me about them - I can bend your ear for hours.
- We both love to read and have an extensive collection of books.

I can most easily be reached via email: ray.kopczynski@cityofalbanynet OR electray@aol.com I do need your opinions to help me do the job as City Councilor for Ward-IIa.

Help me continue the progress Albany has already made. I would appreciate your vote to continue as your City Councilor - Ward II-A

(This information furnished by Ray Kopczynski.)

You have the right to **vote!**

If you are a US citizen, live in Oregon, are 18 years old and have registered to vote.

- **You have the right** to vote even if you are homeless.
- **You have the right** to vote if you have been convicted of a felony but have been released from custody, even if you are on probation or parole.
- **You have the right** to vote even if you have a guardian and even if you need help reading or filling out your ballot.
- **You have the right** to vote or cast your ballot if you are in line by 8 PM on Election Day.
- **You have the right** to know if you are registered to vote.
- **You have the right** to choose whether or not you want to register as a member of a political party.
- **You have the right** to use a signature stamp or other mark but first you have to fill out a form. No one can sign for you.
- **You have the right** to ask for help from elections staff or from a friend or family member. There are some people who cannot help you vote, for example, your boss or a union officer from your job.
- **You have the right** to a secret vote. You do not have to tell anyone how you voted.
- **You have the right** to get a "provisional ballot", even if you are told you are not registered to vote.
- **You have the right** to get a new ballot if you make a mistake.
- **You have the right** to vote for the person you want. You can write in someone else's name if you don't like the choices on your ballot.
- **You have the right** to vote "yes" or "no" on any issue on your ballot.
- **You have the right** to leave some choices blank on your ballot. The choices you do mark will still count.
- **You have the right** to use a voting system for all Federal Elections that makes it equally possible for people with disabilities to vote privately and independently.
- **You have the right** to know if your ballot, including a "provisional ballot", was accepted for counting.
- **You have the right** to file a complaint if you think your voting rights have been denied.

(Oregon Constitution, Sections 2 and 3; ORS Chapters 137, 246, 247, and 254; Vote By Mail Manual; Help America Vote Act of 2002; OAR 165-001-0090 and 165-007-0030)

for more information about voter rights:



1 866 673 VOTE / 1 866 673 8683

se habla español

TTY 1 800 735 2900

for the hearing impaired

Constitution Party

Dear Voter,

The Constitution Party of Oregon asks you to join us in honoring God, defending the family, and seeking to restore our Republic. Our candidates take their oath of office to support the Constitution seriously. They also take the Bible on which they place their hand seriously; they are God-fearing individuals.

We are NOT a sectarian, religious political party. We merely accept the self-evident concept that our rights come from our Creator, not from our government.

Our party is pledged to the following core principles, thus aligning us with the National Alliance of Independent American Parties, of which we are a part:

(1) The Creator God in heaven, made known to us through the Holy Scriptures, rules in the affairs of men and is the ultimate King, Lawgiver, and Judge of all mankind. He is to be honored, and His Word is to be heeded if we expect to receive His blessing on the works of our hands individually or corporately;

(2) the Family is the first and highest civil institution designed by God to propagate, educate, and nurture human life. Both Church and State are to support and defend that institution; and,

(3) God has assigned the first priority of civil government to protect innocent human life from conception to natural death, to protect freedom of conscience, and to protect private property. This is best served by the Constitutional Republic which our Founders gave us and which we are committed to restore.

If you don't like being taxed to police the world while our own borders are unprotected...

If you don't like losing our jobs to other nations because of environmentalist nonsense, uncalled-for government regulation of business, and repressive business taxation...

If you don't like having your rights trampled and your property confiscated...

If you don't like being exposed to God's wrath on our nation because it officially condones the shedding of innocent blood and rampant moral perversion...

Vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you want to restore moral integrity, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you want to revive fiscal sanity, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you want to give liberty a chance, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you want to send a message to the other political parties that you are tired of their endless drift to socialism and tyranny, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you want to exercise your conscience and not vote for the lesser of two evils, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

If you are tired of losing by voting for 'winners' that are really losers, vote for your Constitution Party candidates.

Please look on your ballot for candidates nominated by the Constitution Party. Some of them don't have the funds to place a statement in this pamphlet, but they all have pledged to the above principles. We also have gladly nominated candidates of other parties who subscribe to these principles.

Statewide candidates we have nominated are: Aaron Auer for Governor and James Leuenberger for US Senate. US Congress candidates we have nominated include: Art Robinson, James Buchal, Jason Yates and Raymond Baldwin. Some of you will also find one of our state legislative candidates on your ballot, including: Robert Ekstrom, Barbara Gonzalez, and Michael Marsh.

For more information on our party, its candidates and its platform, go to our website: www.constitutionpartyoregon.org or contact Chairman Jack Brown at (541) 659-4313.

(This information furnished by Constitution Party of Oregon.)

Democratic Party

Oregon Democrats fight for Oregon values. We believe in a fair wage for a hard day's work. We believe in equality. We believe in access to affordable healthcare. We believe in affordable, high-quality education. We believe in putting people before corporate profits.

Join with all the Oregonians voting for our champions of Oregon's middle class:

- U.S. Senator **Jeff Merkley** is making college more affordable, taking on the big banks and China, and fighting to end tax deals that outsource our jobs. Senator Merkley has been leading the fight to protect women's health care and to level the playing field for middle class families, making sure that large corporations and the wealthy pay their fair share. Learn more at www.jeffmerkley.com.
- Governor **John Kitzhaber** is rebuilding a strong, secure middle class by ensuring that Oregon's workforce has the education, training, and skills to get quality jobs for the future. Governor Kitzhaber has worked with small business owners and industry leaders to cut the unemployment rate 3 percentage points and create over 100,000 jobs. Learn more at www.johnkitzhaber.com.
- Elect our great, hard-working team to the U.S. House—Congressman **Peter DeFazio**, Congressman **Earl Blumenauer**, Congressman **Kurt Schrader**, Congresswoman **Suzanne Bonamici**, and **Aelea Christofferson** for Congressional District 2.
- Be sure to cast your vote for **Democratic candidates in the Oregon House and Senate** so that they can keep working for us on the issues that make a real difference in the lives of Oregonians.
- And please support our many **Democratic candidates running for local offices**, working every day to make our communities stronger.

Remember - **the earlier you vote, the better**. The more early votes we get, the more voters we can reach in the crucial final days of the election.

As Oregon Democrats, we stand for our values:

- Family wage jobs and workers rights
- Equality for all, including marriage equality
- High quality education
- Affordable healthcare
- Retirement security
- National security
- Civil liberties and transparent government

As Oregon Democrats, we also urge you to vote NO on Measure 90. It would strip away our right to choose our own nominees and could create elections where no Democrat would be on the general election ballot in many races.

If you need information on Democratic candidates and statewide ballot measures to help you fill out your ballot, you can find them on our website: www.dpo.org.

On behalf of the Democratic Party of Oregon, thank you. We look forward to your involvement in the Democratic team.

Respectfully,
Frank Dixon
Chair, Democratic Party of Oregon

To learn more about how you can help Democrats win, contact us:

www.dpo.org • info@dpo.org • (503) 224-8200
232 NE 9th Ave., Portland OR 97232

Paid for by the Democratic Party of Oregon.

Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee. www.dpo.org

(This information furnished by Democratic Party of Oregon.)

Independent Party**THE INDEPENDENT PARTY AGENDA FOR OREGON**

The Independent Party is committed to working collaboratively in service to the public interest. We offer this written pledge to restore accountability in government and to promote the renewal of Oregon and America. We will work to:

1. Reduce special interest and “big money” influence over all government processes.
2. Increase transparency in government, especially on how our tax dollars are spent.
3. Protect Oregon consumers from ripoffs and abuse.
4. Improve education and job training opportunities for Oregonians.
5. Provide incentives for business creation and expansion in Oregon but only if the incentives return greater benefit to the public than they cost.
6. Oppose spending on inefficient government programs.

Democratic and Republican officeholders are controlled by their “donors.” Winning a contested race for the Oregon Legislature now typically costs over \$600,000, sometimes over \$1 million.

Campaign spending on Oregon races has increased by over 800% since 1996.

When Independent candidates win, they will need to pay attention to Independent voters, not just big donors.

MANY VOICES JOINING TOGETHER

We are Oregon’s third largest party, with over 101,000 new members since 2007. Adding 7,000 more members will make us Oregon’s third major party, giving Independent candidates an equal place alongside Republicans and Democrats.

HOW WE DIFFER - MEMBERS LEAD THE WAY

Our agenda is determined by our members (not financial donors). In our 2014 survey, the members said Oregon government should:

- Require that political advertisements identify their main sources of funding (84%)
- Increase vocational training opportunities for students in high school and community college (79%)
- Ensure that tax dollars spent to encourage economic development return more benefits to the public than they cost (74%)
- Establish limits on political campaign contributions in state and local races (73%)
- Look at ways to make college more affordable (68%)
- Reform the state primary election so that more voters can participate (67%)
- Protect farmland and increasing diversity of agricultural products (64%)
- Reduce government spending (64%)

OUR MEMBERS ARE MAKING A DIFFERENCE

We led the fight to stop the 2011 Legislature from creating a huge loophole in Oregon’s campaign finance disclosure laws, even after the Oregon Senate had passed the bill on a unanimous vote.

We also pursued bills to require all campaign ads to disclose who paid for them, to ban legislators from becoming lobbyists for 2 years after leaving office, and requiring the State to give Oregon-based businesses a slight preference when bidding on State contracts. None were passed.

OUR PROMISE TO OREGONIANS

Within the first month of the next legislative session, the Independent Party will introduce the following legislation:

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AMENDMENT:	Amends the Oregon Constitution to allow limits on political campaign contributions to candidates for state and local office.
TRUTH IN CAMPAIGN ADVERTISING ACT:	Requires that political advertisements truthfully disclose their main sources of funding.
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT ACT:	Requires an open and transparent process for the granting of any public money or tax breaks to businesses happens and a refund mechanism when the business’s obligations are not met.
CONSUMER AND SMALL BUSINESS PROTECTION ACT:	Ends the exemption for insurance companies from the Oregon Unlawful Trade Practices Act.
OREGON SMALL BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION ACT:	Provides tax incentives for creation or expansion of <u>small</u> businesses that hire new workers.
OREGON JOB TRAINING ACT:	Creates incentives for businesses to assist in vocational training in partnership with school districts and community colleges; provides state funding for local governments to invest in physical infrastructure to for vocational training.

HELP US - HELP YOURSELF

Vote for candidates with “Independent” next to their names on the ballot.

When Independent candidates win, the entrenched special interests lose.

VOTE. THINK. BE. INDEPENDENT.

www.indparty.com
info@indparty.com
 503-334-3248

(This information furnished by Independent Party of Oregon.)

Libertarian Party

The Libertarian Party of Oregon has grown rapidly in the last two years, with voter registration surging over 20%, and in this election we have nominated a record number of candidates for office – more than all other minor parties, combined!

Vote for Libertarian Candidates

Did you vote for someone promising hope and change, then get more of the same? Did you vote for someone promising responsible spending, only to get more waste? Did they live up to their promises and your expectations? Would you vote for them again, or only *against* someone who seems even worse?

Don't throw away your vote by supporting the “lesser of two evils” major party candidate! Voting for them only encourages and endorses the kind of government we currently have. If you want something different, you need to vote for someone different – *vote for Libertarian candidates!*

Libertarians are truly different. We are not right or left or center, but we will stand on principle and always do what is just.

Statement of Principles

We, the members of the Libertarian Party, challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual.

We hold that all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties other than our own grant to government the right to regulate the lives of individuals and seize the fruits of their labor without their consent.

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life – accordingly we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action – accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property – accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. People should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

Join Us

If these principles appeal to you, we invite you to switch your voter registration to “Libertarian” to join the cause of advancing liberty and freedom. There are never any dues or fees required to participate in our primary elections or conventions, or to be a candidate for public office, and party leadership is directly elected by our members. There are many opportunities for true grassroots activism.

For more information, visit our website: <http://lporegon.org>

Facebook group: <http://www.facebook.com/groups/lporegon/>

Meetup group: <http://www.meetup.com/libertarian-365/>

Ballot Measures Poll Results

The Libertarian Party of Oregon’s primary election included a poll on many of this year’s potential ballot measures. Four of the measures in our poll qualified for the general election ballot. The results of our poll, indicating the general sentiment of party members, are below:

Measure 86: **NO** (70.5%)

Measure 87: not polled

Measure 88: **NO** (70.2%)

Measure 89: **YES** (80.6%)

Measure 90: not polled

Measure 91: **YES** (79.2%)

Measure 92: not polled

(This information furnished by Libertarian Party of Oregon.)

Pacific Green Party

Oregonians beware—Ballot Measure 90 is a threat to your right to vote.

BM 90 will limit your choices at the November General Election. If BM 90 passes, Oregonians’ right to vote will be restricted to the “choice” of just two candidates in each race.

BM 90 will eliminate independent and third party candidates from the November election.

BM 90 will create elections where you have no real choice. Your “choices” in a particular race could be limited to just two Democrats or two Republicans.

BM 90 would create a “Top Two” election system. Top Two has been a complete failure in California where it has been used for two elections. Voter turnout in California hit an all-time low using Top Two. Californians from across the political spectrum are calling for its repeal.

Democracy is about the freedom to choose.

Protect your freedom.

Protect your right to vote.

VOTE NO ON BALLOT MEASURE 90

Prohibition has failed, again. Ballot Measure 91 would end cannabis prohibition.

The Pacific Green Party has been at the forefront of the legalization debate. Now, most voters agree with us. The war on cannabis has turned otherwise law-abiding citizens into criminals. When cannabis is regulated and taxed, we will raise revenue from taxation and save money by not arresting and prosecuting people simply for the use of a substance no more harmful than tobacco or alcohol.

VOTE YES ON BALLOT MEASURE 91

We have the right to know what’s in our food.

It’s really that simple.

VOTE YES ON BALLOT MEASURE 92

The Pacific Green Party is Different

We are governed by principles and values. Unlike Democrats and Republicans, we do not accept corporate cash.

Our platform is based on our values of peace, sustainability, grassroots democracy and justice for all.

Peace

War is *not* the answer.

The undeclared war in Afghanistan is the longest and costliest in the history of our nation. Republicans and Democrats have subjected our country to one illegal and immoral war after another; draining our treasury, diverting funds from domestic needs, subverting our Constitution and resulting in an overwhelming and unnecessary loss of innocent lives.

Bringing our troops home, including Oregon’s National Guard, will make us and the world safer.

Sustainability

What’s good for the environment is good for the economy.

Mass transit, re-forestation and organic and sustainable agriculture—including industrial hemp—will stimulate the economy and conserve resources for future generations. Developing renewable energy will help create jobs, promote peace and address global warming. We must take immediate action or else risk the collapse of the ecosystems on which we depend.

Democracy

We support campaign spending limits and public campaign financing to challenge the hijacking of our elections by Big Money interests.

We support Instant Runoff Voting and Proportional Representation because democracy is strengthened by diversity and increased public participation.

We support amending both the Oregon and United States constitutions to prevent corporations from undermining the democratic process.

Justice

Greens support equal rights and the right of people to marry whom they choose.

Greens support universal, single-payer health care for all.

We call for an end to Marijuana Prohibition.

Green Success!

Greens hold elected office throughout the world and across the country. In Oregon, Pacific Green Party members include city councilors, a Circuit Court judge and the president of the Corvallis City Council.

Join the Party

If you share our values, then the Pacific Green Party is *your* party and *your* voice in the political system. Register to vote Pacific Green at your local county elections office or on-line at www.oregonvotes.gov.

Working together, we can make our voices heard and translate our values into action; improving our lives and our communities and creating a better world for future generations.

www.pacificgreens.org facebook/pacificgreens

(This information furnished by Pacific Green Party of Oregon.)

Progressive Party

Chris Henry Governor
Jeff Merkley U.S. Senate
Steven Reynolds U.S. House, 1st District
Peter DeFazio U.S. House, 4th District

We fight for economic justice, human rights, environmental protection, and grassroots democracy.

WE OPPOSE: corruption of elections by big money, Wall Street bailouts, the war in Afghanistan and any more war in Iraq, "corporate personhood" and the NAFTA, WTO, and TPP "free trade" agreements.

WE SUPPORT: real campaign finance reform, Medicare for All, equal rights (including same-sex marriage), and much higher minimum wages.

We are very different from the Establishment parties.

	Democratic	Republican	Progressive
Real campaign finance reform, particularly in <u>Oregon</u>	NO	NO	YES
"Medicare for All" comprehensive health care	NO	NO	YES
Oppose cuts in Social Security & Medicare benefits	NO	NO	YES
Increase minimum wages to living wage (\$15 or more)	NO	NO	YES
Employment for All (public works projects, WPA style)	NO	NO	YES
Increase income taxes on big corporations and the wealthy	NO	NO	YES
Oppose Wall Street bailouts	NO	NO	YES
Repair, improve infrastructure (transportation, water systems, etc.)	NO	NO	YES
Oppose NAFTA, WTO, Trans-Pacific Partnership "free trade" deals; support local products & services	NO	NO	YES
Oppose war in Iraq, Afghanistan; bring troops home now and stop sending in more	NO	NO	YES
Slash military spending and foreign bases	NO	NO	YES
End occupation of Palestine	NO	NO	YES
Oppose spying on Americans, including drones	NO	NO	YES
Equal rights for all; same-sex marriage	???	NO	YES
Clean energy; no nuclear subsidies	NO	NO	YES
Oppose shipping coal or oil for export from Pacific Northwest ports	NO	NO	YES
Oppose offshore oil & gas drilling	NO	NO	YES
Legalize marijuana possession and use	???	NO	YES
End "corporate personhood" and constitutional rights for corporations	NO	NO	YES
Require labeling of genetically engineered food	NO	NO	YES
End the U.S. Senate filibuster; restore majority rule	NO	NO	YES

OREGON ISSUES

1. We work for real campaign finance reform. Oregon Democrats and Republicans have never enacted limits on political campaign contributions but have repealed voter-enacted limits 3 times. Campaign spending for Oregon state offices has skyrocketed from \$4 million in 1996 to \$57 million in 2010. Spending by candidates for Oregon Legislature increased another 13% in 2012. Winning a contested race for the Legislature now typically costs over \$600,000, sometimes over \$1 million.
2. The initiative and referendum should be available to grass-roots efforts. The Democrat Secretary of State is now discarding over 30% of all voter signatures on initiative petitions due to arbitrary, hyper-technical, and unnecessary rules, raising the cost of petition drives so high that only corporations, unions and the very wealthy can afford to use it.
3. The State Treasurer should direct part of Oregon's \$87 billion of investment funds to invest in local public works and jobs for Oregonians instead of vulture capitalists, corporate raiders, leveraged buyout artists, and fossil fuel corporations and vendors.
4. We want fair taxation. Oregon has the 4th highest income taxes of any state on lower-income working families and is still at the bottom in taxes on corporations.
5. Government should stop promoting gambling, including video poker, video slots, and approval of private casinos.
6. We oppose installation of police "spy cameras" and use of drones to spy on Oregon citizens.
7. We oppose using public money to subsidize rail transport of oil or coal through Oregon communities.

OREGON BALLOT MEASURE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Vote **NO** on Measure 90: "Top Two Primary" (destroys minor parties) saveoregonsdemocracy.org

Vote **YES** on:

- Measure 88 -- allows "driver cards" for Oregon residents without proof of US citizenship
- Measure 89 -- amends Oregon constitution to forbid government discrimination "on account of sex"
- Measure 91 -- legalizes growing and possessing of small amounts of marijuana by adults
- Measure 92 -- requires labeling of genetically engineered food sold in Oregon

progparty.org info@progparty.org 503-548-2797 866-926-9646 fax
chrishenryforgovernor.org jeffmerkley.com defazioforcongress.org codyfororegon.com

(This information furnished by Oregon Progressive Party.)

Republican Party

The Oregon Republican Party is working for all Oregonians by promoting limited government, lower taxes, and personal responsibility. Limiting government to its proper role in your life gives you the opportunity to achieve success. Lowering taxes allows you to keep more of the money you earn and chart your own course in life. Personal responsibility eliminates dependency on the government and maximizes your individual freedom.

We are proud to be the majority party in many parts of Oregon, but we need your vote and your support to implement our policies statewide. It has been over 25 years since Republican policies were implemented statewide in Oregon and we are all seeing the failed policies of the Democrat majority affect our everyday life. With your vote our Republican leaders can begin working to put Republican ideas into action to benefit all Oregonians.

- **Accountability in Spending.** Hold the Democrats accountable for the millions of dollars wasted by Governor Kitzhaber and the Democrats in Salem. Failed projects like CoverOregon must stop. Oregon Republicans will focus on programs that work.
- **Reduction in Taxes.** Oregon Republicans say NO to continuous tax increases. Democrat policies require more and more taxes for programs that do not address the real needs of Oregonians. Oregon Republicans will only support meaningful programs that address relevant issues, such job creation and affordable health care.
- **Protection of our Environment.** Oregon Republicans share a common interest in protecting the scenic beauty and livability of our great state. We believe there is a balance between the environment and our natural resources. Healthy sustainable forests lead to a vibrant wood products industry that provides family wage jobs. Clean water flowing in our rivers and ocean estuaries benefits us all through tourism, recreation and fisheries industry jobs. We must use a common sense approach to balance these issues.
- **School Funding and Education.** Over the last ten years, Oregon Republicans in the legislature have worked to fund our schools first! Republicans elected to school boards around the state are working to make every tax dollar count. We're working to make our children's future more secure, allowing them to compete in today's market.

Consider what is at stake for your future and the future of our state. We invite you to join the Oregon Republican Party, be part of the political process, and be part of bringing back the opportunity and freedom we once enjoyed as citizens of this great state. Please register as a Republican and become an active citizen. Join us, for a better Oregon!

Read our platform and see how our beliefs, concerns and ideas match yours:

National Republican Party Platform: http://www.gop.com/2012-republican-platform_home/

Oregon Republican Party Platform: <http://www.oregonrepublicanparty.org/Platform2013>

Republicans will put Oregon on the right track by ridding our government of wasteful spending and building an environment that welcomes job creation. We have nominated a great slate of candidates in 2014. They are ready to lead Oregon to prosperity.

- **DENNIS RICHARDSON** for Governor: www.dennisrichardson.com
- **MONICA WEHBY** for US Senator: www.monicaforeregon.com
- **JASON YATES** for 1st Congressional District: www.yatesforcongress.com
- **GREG WALDEN** for 2nd Congressional District: www.gregwalden.com
- **JAMES BUCHAL** for 3rd Congressional District: www.buchal.nationbuilder.com
- **ART ROBINSON** for 4th Congressional District: www.artrobinsonforcongress.com
- **TOOTIE SMITH** for 5th Congressional District: www.tootiesmithoregon.com
- **OREGON HOUSE REPUBLICANS:** www.oregonhouserepublicans.org
- **OREGON SENATE REPUBLICANS:** www.theleadershipfund.com

Our recommendations for the 2014 Ballot Measures:

Measure 86 – VOTE NO – Loans best made by private sector

Measure 87 – No Position

Measure 88 – VOTE NO – Driving is a privilege, should require legal status

Measure 89 – No Position

Measure 90 – VOTE NO – Confusing, unintended consequences, see Opposition Statement

Measure 91 – VOTE NO – Creates more problems than benefits

Measure 92 – VOTE NO – Complicated, expensive and unfair to farmers/ranchers

Oregon Republican Party: www.oregonrepublicanparty.org

Republican National Committee: www.gop.com

The Growth and Opportunity Project: www.goproject.gop.com

Contact Us:

Oregon Republican Party

info@orgop.org

503-595-8881

PO Box 1586, Lake Oswego, OR 97035

(This information furnished by The Oregon Republican Party.)

Working Families Party

What is the Working Families Party?

The Working Families Party is fighting for a brighter future for Oregon. One where the economy works for everyone, not just the wealthy and well connected. One where politicians are accountable to working people, instead of Wall Street lobbyists and corporate CEOs. One where all of us, no matter where we come from, can find a good job, get healthcare when we need it, afford a home, send our kids to good schools, and have a secure retirement.

We're about improving the economy for working people.

We fight for new jobs, living wages, workers' rights, better education, affordable health care for everyone, and a government that listens to working families, not huge corporations or other high-powered special interests.

How do we make sure that politicians listen to us?

We research the records of all candidates running for office in Oregon --- Democrats, Republicans or independents. Then we support the ones with a record of standing up for the bread and butter economic issues that really matter to working- and middle-class families.

What does it mean when you see "Working Families" next to a candidate's name?

It means you know that they have our seal of approval -- and you can vote for them with the confidence that they will do the best job of fighting for working people.

Now let's get specific. Here are just a couple of the economic issues we're asking legislators to join us in fighting for this year:

Debt-free Higher Education: The student debt crisis is hurting students, their families and the entire Oregon economy. We are championing an innovative solution called Pay It Forward that would allow students to attend a public college or university debt free in exchange for paying a small percentage of their future income. Pay It Forward would make college accessible to working-class and middle-class students who currently have to take out large loans to afford an education.

Earned Sick Days for Everyone: We believe that you shouldn't have to choose between losing your job and staying home when you or a loved one is ill. That's why we have stood with hard working families in Portland and Eugene to make earned sick days a reality in those cities. Now it's time that all workers in the state have access to this basic right, which is why now we are fighting for statewide earned sick days legislation.

And here are some initiatives on the ballot that we are supporting and that we urge you to vote for:

Oregon Opportunity Initiative: The Opportunity Initiative will create a dedicated fund for higher education that will invest in people to generate income for the state. Income from returns will increase student aid grants allowing more Oregonians to get an education and make better jobs accessible to hard working families.

Keeping Our Roads and Communities Safe: Driver cards help Oregon residents follow the law and improve safety for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians by reducing the number of uninsured and unlicensed drivers on the road. Seniors, immigrant families and workers are among the thousands of Oregonians who need this option to safely get to work, church and school.

A New Approach to Marijuana: We support a new approach to marijuana in Oregon: Rather than criminalizing marijuana, we believe it is time to regulate and tax it, and in so doing raise much needed revenue for the state. This would create jobs as well as produce funding for schools and drug treatment and law enforcement, while taking money away from criminal organizations.

Join us!

We're building our Party from the ground up. Voting for WFP-nominated candidates not only sends a message that these issues are important, it helps us build an organization that can truly represent working people in Oregon politics. Join us as we fight for an economy that works for working families.

Learn more and sign up at www.WorkingFamilies.org/Oregon

(This information furnished by Oregon Working Families Party.)

Senate Joint Resolution 1 — Referred to the Electorate of Oregon by the Legislative Assembly of the 2013 Regular Session to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

86

Amends Constitution: Requires creation of fund for Oregonians pursuing post-secondary education, authorizes state indebtedness to finance fund

Estimate of Financial Impact	31
Text of Measure	32
Explanatory Statement	32
Legislative Argument in Support	34
Arguments in Favor	34
Arguments in Opposition	38

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote amends constitution and requires legislature to establish fund for Oregonians pursuing post-secondary education, career training; authorizes state to incur debt to finance fund.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote rejects authorization for state to extend credit and incur debt to create dedicated fund for Oregon students pursuing post-secondary education and career training.

Summary

Amends Constitution. Oregon constitution generally prohibits the state from extending credit or incurring debt. Measure requires the legislature to create dedicated fund for exclusive benefit of Oregon students pursuing post-secondary education, including technical, professional and career training. Measure authorizes state to lend credit and incur debt to finance fund. Indebtedness incurred may not exceed one percent of real market value of all property in state. Moneys in fund not subject to constitutional limitations on investment. Generated earnings must be retained by fund, unless used to provide financial assistance to Oregon students pursuing post-secondary education. If governor declares an emergency, legislature may pass a bill to use the fund’s money for any lawful purpose, provided the legislature also has approved a plan to repay the fund.

Estimate of Financial Impact

There is no financial effect on either state or local government expenditures or revenues.

Text of Measure

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

PARAGRAPH 1. The Constitution of the State of Oregon is amended by creating a new Article to be known as Article XI-R, such Article to read:

ARTICLE XI-R

SECTION 1. (1) In the manner provided by law and notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 7, Article XI of this Constitution, the credit of the State of Oregon may be loaned and indebtedness incurred to:

(a) Finance the corpus of the Oregon Student Opportunity Fund established pursuant to section 3 of this Article.

(b) Refinance indebtedness incurred under this section.

(2) Indebtedness incurred under this section may be used to pay the costs of issuing, administering and paying indebtedness incurred under this section.

SECTION 2. (1) Indebtedness may be incurred under section 1 of this Article in an aggregate principal amount that does not exceed, at any one time, one percent of the real market value of all property in this state.

(2) Indebtedness incurred under section 1 of this Article is a general obligation of the State of Oregon and must contain a direct promise on behalf of the State of Oregon to pay the principal of, the interest on and the premium, if any, on the obligation. The full faith and credit and taxing power of the State of Oregon must be pledged to pay the principal of, the interest on and the premium, if any, on the obligation. However, the State of Oregon may not pledge or levy an ad valorem tax to pay the indebtedness.

SECTION 3. (1) The Legislative Assembly shall establish a fund to be known as the Oregon Student Opportunity Fund. The moneys in the Oregon Student Opportunity Fund must be used for the exclusive benefit of Oregon students pursuing post-secondary education, including technical, professional and career training.

(2) In addition to the deposit of proceeds of indebtedness described in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 1 of this Article, moneys in the fund may include:

(a) Gifts, devises or bequests made to the State of Oregon for deposit in the fund; and

(b) Any other moneys deposited in the fund by law.

(3) Moneys described in subsection (2) of this section that are deposited in the fund:

(a) May be invested as provided by law and are not subject to the limitations of section 6, Article XI of this Constitution.

(b) Must be retained in the fund, except as provided in subsection (6) of this section.

(4) Earnings on moneys in the fund:

(a) Must be credited to the fund; and

(b) May be retained in the fund or used to provide financial assistance to Oregon students pursuing post-secondary education, including technical, professional and career training.

(5) The Legislative Assembly may pass a bill to appropriate earnings on moneys in the fund for the purpose described in subsection (4)(b) of this section.

(6) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, when the Governor declares an emergency pursuant to this subsection, the Legislative Assembly, with the approval of four-fifths of the members present in each house, may pass a bill to:

(a) Use the moneys for any lawful purpose if the Legislative Assembly has approved a plan to replenish the fund on appropriate terms.

(b) Use all or a portion of the moneys in the fund to pay the principal of, interest on and premium, if any, on indebtedness incurred under section 1 of this Article.

SECTION 4. The Legislative Assembly may enact legislation to carry out the provisions of this Article.

SECTION 5. This Article supersedes conflicting provisions of this Constitution.

PARAGRAPH 2. The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the next regular general election held throughout this state.

Note: **Boldfaced** type indicates new language; *[brackets and italic]* type indicates deletions or comments.

Explanatory Statement

With limited exceptions, the Oregon Constitution prohibits the state from incurring general obligation debt. Ballot Measure 86 amends the Oregon Constitution by adding an Article directing the Legislature to create the Oregon Student Opportunity Fund and allowing the state to issue general obligation bonds to capitalize it.

Except in a declared emergency, only the earnings from the proceeds of any bonds issued for the Fund, after issuance and administration costs, can be used to provide financial assistance to Oregon students pursuing post secondary education, including technical, professional and career training. The Article also allows other gifts or bequests to be added to the Fund, but only the earnings from those sources may be used for financial assistance.

Any bonds issued would be a general obligation of the state and backed by the full faith and credit and taxing power of the State of Oregon, but not including the power to levy an ad valorem (property) tax.

Repayment of bond principal and interest shall be from the state General Fund, which comes primarily from individual and business income taxes.

Bonding for the Fund is limited to a maximum of one percent of the real market value of all property in the state. One percent of the current real market value is approximately \$4.3 billion. The measure does not authorize a specific issuance of bonds. Any such issuance would be through additional legislation and subject to the total debt limitation of the state.

If the Governor declares an emergency and the Legislature, with four-fifths approval in both houses, passes legislation authorizing it, money in the Fund may be used temporarily for emergency purposes, such as bond repayments and interest, or any other legal purpose. If the Legislature authorizes use of the Fund money for other legal purposes, the Legislature must approve a plan to replenish the Fund on appropriate terms.

Committee Members:

Senator Lee Beyer
Representative Tobias Read
Steve Buckstein
Dr. Eric Fruits
Paul De Muniz

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Legislative Argument in Support

The Oregon State Legislature urges you to Vote Yes on Measure 86 because Oregon needs to increase student financial aid for college and vocational training. Today too many students are priced out of post-secondary education and/or training because of increasing tuition costs and limited financial aid.

Regardless of their economic background **every** Oregon student deserves the chance to reach their full potential. With so many critical issues regarding K-12 education, public safety, health care, and other services Oregon has been unable to adequately fund financial aid for students/trainees. Measure 86 gives the Legislature an additional legal option to support our students.

It does this by enabling the Legislature to invest in a permanent growing endowment dedicated to student aid for higher education and/or professional/technical training. Because Measure 86 authorizes the Legislature to issue bonds to seed this fund no new tax revenue is required. And because the endowment will grow over time, future student financial aid will face reduced competition with other vital services for limited budget dollars.

The real beneficiaries of Measure 86 will be Oregon students who seek to better themselves and increase their chances of economic success by completing their college degrees or gaining essential skills through vocational training. Oregon will also benefit from a more highly trained workforce that will attract more investments in industries that provide living wage jobs. The best economic development program we can have is education and Measure 86 will take a huge step forward in ensuring Oregon will continue to flourish in the 21st Century.

Measure 86 gives us the chance to help these students achieve their goals by providing them with the resources they need to complete their education.

We urge you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

Committee Members:	Appointed by:
Senator Lee Beyer	President of the Senate
Representative Bob Jenson	Speaker of the House
Representative Tobias Read	Speaker of the House

(This Joint Legislative Committee was appointed to provide the legislative argument in support of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.245.)

Argument in Favor

SEIU Local 503 Urges a Yes Vote on Measure 86

Measure 86 Helps Oregon Kids Afford a College Degree

One of the best pathways to living wage jobs for Oregonians is a college degree or skills acquired through technical training. That's why SEIU Local 503 urges you to vote YES on Measure 86.

The skyrocketing cost of college keeps many Oregonians from even trying to get a college degree. Oregon's current financial aid program- the Oregon Opportunity Grant- is meant to help kids afford college, but is only available to one in five students who need it. Worse still, those funds are only available for one year, not the four it takes to earn a bachelor's degree. That's just wrong.

College isn't the right choice for everyone, but everyone should have the chance at a good career. Unfortunately, the lack of vocational and technical training for workers who need it limits their career options.

Women and people of color are disproportionately affected by this lack of opportunity.

That's where Measure 86 comes in. Measure 86 creates a permanent, growing endowment for student aid and vocational training for low income Oregonians. The fund can only be used for that purpose – it is locked and cannot be raided by the Legislature.

Further, because the fund is separate from the state's general fund, increased student aid won't come at the expense of other vital public services like support for seniors, kids and families in need.

Everyone deserves a fair shot to go to college or get technical training, Measure 86 helps give them that.

Please vote YES on Measure 86.

(This information furnished by Melissa Unger, SEIU Local 503.)

Argument in Favor

The Democratic Party of Oregon enthusiastically endorses Measure 86, the Oregon Opportunity Initiative, because it embodies the best of our core values: equal opportunity, economic advancement and the value of education.

Measure 86 expresses these values by doing the following:

- Increases access to higher education and job training by making them more affordable
- Fosters the expansion of vocational and technical job training opportunities
- Lowers student debt

It accomplishes these goals by creating a permanent, growing endowment for student aid and vocational training aimed at lower-income and lower-middle- income students. The best universities in the world – Harvard, MIT and Stanford – have endowments for their students. It's time for Oregon to create an endowment for our students.

As Democrats we know that college and skills-based education can make the difference between struggle and success. If you are willing to do the hard work to gain a degree or learn new skills you should have the chance to do so.

We've heard speech after speech about the need to develop the workforce of the future, but too often those words are not matched with action. Measure 86 is a real plan that charts an authentic path forward.

If you support opportunity, education and a competitive Oregon economy you should support Measure 86.

Vote YES on Measure 86.

(This information furnished by Brad Martin, Democratic Party of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor**Small Businesses say YES to 86!**

We have a crisis in Oregon, and it affects all of us. As the economy recovers, businesses need talented, educated employees. Without a skilled workforce, businesses can't grow and prosper, and our economy suffers as a result.

Unfortunately, higher education is beyond the means of some students. Daunted by rising tuition, and justifiably concerned about the burden of student loan debt, many are unable to pursue their dreams. And without a skilled talent pool from which to hire, small businesses suffer.

Ballot Measure 86 will create a funding stream that will improve affordable access to higher education, boosting the skills of our workforce.

And it does so...
**without raising taxes and
without impacting other services.**

As small businesses, we like to keep it local. We want to hire skilled Oregon workers who can help our businesses and, subsequently, the Oregon economy thrive. That is why we support Measure 86.

The Main Street Alliance of Oregon urges you to support small and local businesses: VOTE YES on 86.

(This information furnished by Stephen Michael, The Main Street Alliance of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

City Club of Portland Recommends a Yes Vote
Support New Funding Options for Higher Education
and Career Training

What does this measure do?

This measure creates a permanent fund protected by the State Constitution that would provide financial assistance for post-secondary education to Oregon students.

While the Student Opportunity Fund could be funded through a variety of means, the measure authorizes initial funding from the proceeds of bonds issued by the state, if the Legislature chooses to do so.

The method for how the Opportunity Fund's earnings would be distributed to students would be decided through the legislative process and is not addressed in this ballot measure.

Why has this been proposed?

In many states, public support of higher education has been declining over the past 30 years. In 2013, Oregon rated 47 out of 50 in state funding per student. As a result, student debt is rising and not enough local workers are trained in science, technology, engineering, or math fields (STEM), yet this education is vital to employment in emerging industries.

Higher education is a well-established factor in driving higher wages, per-capita income, and overall self-sufficiency. For lower and middle income earners, education plays an important role in the ability to participate in the labor market, especially since it is projected that by 2020, 65 percent of all jobs will require some form of post-secondary education.

Why vote yes?

- Provide a strong encouragement for additional state investment in post-secondary education.
- Support a larger economic development strategy to make Oregon's workforce more competitive.
- This measure supports technical training as well as university education.

- This fund could become a sustainable and long-term source of funding.

City Club Members Vote:

Yes 81%
No 19%

Who is City Club of Portland?

We bring together civic-minded people to make Portland and Oregon better places to live, work and play for everyone.

Read our complete recommendation and become a City Club member at:

www.pdxcityclub.org

(This information furnished by Karen Kervin, President, City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 86 is a simple and responsible plan to make it easier for Oregon to fund student financial aid to attend Oregon universities and community colleges, reduce student debt, and support vocational and technical job training at the community college level.

Advanced education and training is becoming more important to our economy, and Measure 86 is an important workforce development tool. It is one way to connect Oregonians with the education and training they will need to be competitive in a global, skills-based economy.

Measure 86 does so by giving the legislature permission to create a permanent, growing endowment, called the Student Opportunity Fund. As the endowment grows with time, proceeds will fund student aid and job training programs. The endowment will be locked and cannot be raided by the legislature for other purposes.

Measure 86 does not raise taxes – it merely gives the legislature improved financial options to make better use of the resources they already have. No guarantees will be made by the state regarding benefits or rates of return. The State's Financial Estimate Commission ruled that Measure 86 has "no financial impact" on the state.

The endowment created by Measure 86 will be exactly the same as endowments used successfully for decades by Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and many other educational institutions for their students. The only difference is that it will be for our students here in Oregon.

If Oregonians find employment in skilled, higher-wage jobs, they are more likely to be economically self-sufficient and less reliant on costly social services. That's why Measure 86 is supported by a remarkable coalition of business, labor, education leaders, and community groups.

I ask you for your support. Please vote YES on Measure 86.

(This information furnished by Ted Wheeler, Oregon State Treasurer.)

Argument in Favor

The League of Women Voters of Oregon (LWVOR) supports Measure 86:

"The League of Women Voters of Oregon believes the primary goal of Oregon's public postsecondary education should be to provide a broad spectrum of higher education for professional, vocational, and personal enrichment to all qualified and motivated individuals."

<http://www.lwvor.org/league-announces-positions-on-2014-oregon-ballot-measures/>

click on: Official-Letter-for-2014-General-Election-Ballot-Measures.pdf 8/25/14

Educational Leaders support Measure 86:

There is no more important investment that we can make than providing for the success of future generations. Measure 86 is a positive step forward to providing a dedicated fund that will be used, in addition to other Oregon Opportunity Grant funding sources, to provide for an educated Oregon citizenry and a thriving middle class. Student debt and college affordability have become a drag on our economic vitality. I personally believe passage of this Measure is an important component towards a robust Oregon competing in a global economy.

Mark Weiss
President of Western Oregon University (for identification purposes)

Students attend community college to gain real-life skills to improve their lives. We know an educated, skilled workforce contributes to a vibrant economy, but higher education is financially out of the reach of many. Measure 86 will create more opportunity for students to gain marketable skills and reduce the burden of debt for our next generation. It won't raise taxes or impact other programs. Vote yes on 86.

Rosemary Baker-Monaghan
Chairperson, Clatsop Community College Board of Directors

(This information furnished by KJ Lewis.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's economic competitiveness depends on an educated and highly-trained workforce. As such, higher education and advanced training will become more important in the future, not less. This is particularly true in Oregon, where our traded sector economy produces goods from wood products to high tech electronic components to athletic footwear to clean energy.

Unfortunately, we're seeing a lot of talented Oregonians opt out of advanced education and training, and companies in this state are struggling to hire qualified people for family wage jobs. This is bad for Oregon businesses and bad for the economy.

The sad truth is that Oregon ranks 47th among states when it comes to state assistance for higher education. Without a highly-trained workforce wages will be lower, and it will be hard for workers to support their families.

That's why the Oregon Business Association urges you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

Measure 86 creates a permanent, growing endowment dedicated to advanced education and training. It has three goals: 1) to make higher education and job training more affordable and accessible; 2) to reduce student debt; and 3) to encourage the expansion of vocational and technical job training opportunities, because while not everyone needs or wants to attend a college or university, all Oregonians need access to skills that will be essential to Oregon's economy in the future.

Measure 86 accomplishes all these goals without increasing taxes. That's a win-win.

Oregon must invest now in advanced education and training to ensure our students find better paying jobs and contribute to Oregon's future economic competitiveness. Measure 86 will help.

The Oregon Business Association urges you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

(This information furnished by DJ Vogt, VP, Government Affairs, Oregon Business Association.)

Argument in Favor

We support higher education and opportunity for ALL Oregonians!

We say

YES

to

Ballot Measure 86!

Governor Barbara Roberts
Former Governor Ted Kulongoski (2003-2011)
Oregon State Treasurer Ted Wheeler

Business

The Main Street Alliance of Oregon
Oregon Business Association

Educational Leaders

Larry Large
Mark Weiss, President, Western Oregon University
(for identification purposes)
Scott Coltrane, Interim President, University of Oregon
(for identification purposes)
Bobbie Regan
Rosemary Baker-Monaghan, Chairperson, Clatsop
Community College Board of Directors
Charles Schlimpert, President Concordia University
The Oregon State University Foundation

Labor

American Federation of Teachers -- Oregon (AFT-Oregon)
Oregon Education Association
SEIU Local 503
Oregon AFSCME

Community Organizations & Leaders

City Club of Portland
Basic Rights Oregon
African American Chamber of Commerce
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
Black Parent Initiative
Impact NW
David Leslie, Executive Director, Ecumenical
Ministries of Oregon
YWCA of Greater Portland
Democratic Party of Oregon
Multnomah County Democratic Party
Willamette Women Democrats
Oregon Working Families

Partial list. Learn more at www.oregonopportunity.org

(This information furnished by KJ Lewis.)

Argument in Favor

Over the past forty years, I have been honored to serve in the highest levels of leadership at Willamette University, Reed College and the University of Oregon, and currently serve as President of the Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities. I have raised money for these and other institutions for scholarships and endowments dedicated to support financially needy students. All through these years, I have hoped that policymakers in Oregon would tackle the serious issue of committing public support for student aid. I submit that this need presses us today as never before.

Measure 86 is addressing that need and doing so in a serious way.

Measure 86 gives hope to Oregonians who dream of attending college but fear they cannot afford it. It gives hope to parents who, despite their hard work and best intentions, do not have the means to send their kids to college in Oregon.

Passing Ballot Measure 86 will make it easier for Oregon to fund student financial aid, reduce student debt, and support job training at community colleges. It allows the Legislature to create an endowment, one that is dedicated to ensuring

lower-income Oregonians access to higher education and vocational training.

Oregon's economy will benefit from increased access and attainment of advanced education for Oregon students. The evidence is clear that the higher proportion of Oregonians who attain postsecondary education, the greater the income for the graduates and for the State of Oregon.

Educational institutions may look very different 50 years from now due to new technologies and societal changes, but the need for education and workforce development will remain. Because Measure 86 creates a permanent endowment that exists for only this purpose, Oregon will have the resources needed, whatever the future holds.

I urge you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

(This information furnished by Larry D. Large.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 86 is a reasonable solution to increase student aid in Oregon. Measure 86 will provide Oregonians with the opportunity to obtain a college education or career training.

I encourage you to support Measure 86.

Measure 86 is a long-term plan to ensure that Oregonians who want access to post-secondary education and career training can get it. Measure 86 creates the Student Opportunity Fund, a permanent, growing source of need-based student aid at our universities and incentives for career-training programs at our community colleges. Measure 86 will make education in our universities and community colleges affordable for more Oregon students.

The fund will be locked and cannot be raided by the Legislature for other purposes. Best of all, Measure 86 does not raise taxes.

Oregon's economic future depends on our ability to educate and develop a solid workforce. Our students deserve the chance to earn success by working at jobs in a vibrant economy. To do so, we need to open the doors to advanced education and training for all Oregonians. Measure 86 will help us do that.

I urge you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

Former Governor Ted Kulongoski (2003-2011)

(This information furnished by Ted Kulongoski, Former Governor (2003-2011).)

Argument in Favor

My name is Wendy. I'm an honor roll student at PCC, a math tutor, a mother to two young girls, a volunteer at OHSU, and a caregiver for my mother, who was recently diagnosed with early onset dementia.

Time is tight. Money is tight.

But my education is important to me, and to the future of our family.

My daughters were both born prematurely and had to spend time in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. Their early struggles, and the struggle my mom is currently facing, have called on me to become a doctor and researcher. When I finish at PCC, I'll go get my Bachelors and then apply to medical school.

My family is not wealthy. To realize my dreams, I know I'll have to take on student loan debt—a lot of it. I've already borrowed over \$25,000. My husband, who recently completed his degree and is starting his own business, has \$80,000 in student loans.

We'll be paying off educational debt for a long time. My

eldest will just be starting college when our educations are paid for. I can't bear the thought of looking at my child and telling her that there is nothing for her, no savings and no chance to realize her own dreams without taking on large amounts of debt herself. And college costs just keep rising.

I support Measure 86 because I know that 4 out of 5 people who apply for statewide grants don't receive a dime. It's not that they are unqualified. It's that there isn't enough money set aside for them.

I'm working hard to achieve my goals. I don't want an advantage, I just want a chance. A chance to be a doctor for a family like yours, and every Oregonian.

Join me in voting yes on 86, so every hard working student gets a chance to pursue their dreams and change the world.

Wendy Hemken

(This information furnished by Wendy Hemken.)

Argument in Favor

MEASURE 86 – THE OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVE:

- **Improve access to higher education and vocational training programs.**
- **Maintain a well-trained workforce and expand job opportunities.**
- **Establish a permanent, dependable source of funds.**

STUDENTS AND FAMILIES DESERVE A REAL COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION AND JOBS!

Costs for Oregon's higher education system have been tracking with inflation for decades. But as public funding for our community colleges and universities drop, students and families are expected to pick up the slack. **Student debt is over ONE TRILLION dollars, and that's an economic risk to all of us.**

OUR ECONOMY BENEFITS WHEN EVERYONE HAS ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

Public support for access to higher education helps maintain a well-trained workforce for Oregon. **Taxpayers benefit because a more educated population means:**

- Higher per capita wages and increased tax revenue,
- Lower demand on public services, and
- Safer communities.

THE OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVE WILL HELP MAINTAIN DEPENDABLE STUDENT AID

The Opportunity Initiative will create a Constitutionally-protected permanent fund. Earnings from the fund will be applied to student assistance programs (such as grants, loans, or repayable "Pay it Forward" programs).

[!] Oregon already has a similar fund for K-12 called the Common School Fund. Those dollars been invested since statehood and have maintained stable payments to schools even through the 2008 economic downturn.

THE FUND WILL BE FINANCED CAREFULLY AND WITH MINIMAL RISK TO TAXPAYERS

There are a number of ways to finance the Opportunity Fund: state dollars, private donations, or bond sales. If bonds are used, they would come from the State's **existing** bonding capacity, so they would not create an additional liability for taxpayers. The measure prohibits the use of property taxes for repayment of the bonds.

VOTE FOR OPPORTUNITY!

Check sources at [facebook.com/oregonWFP](https://www.facebook.com/oregonWFP)

(This information furnished by Steve Hughes, State Director, Oregon Working Families.)

Argument in Favor

The Black Parent Initiative encourages you to vote Yes on Measure 86.

The Black Parent Initiative is a transformative community provider of holistic parent education services. We are the only organization in Multnomah County solely focused on providing parent and family education as a means of increasing the odds of success for Black children.

Measure 86 will help African-American families, and indeed, all families with children who seek to better their lives through education by increasing student aid for college and vocational training.

Measure 86 will create a permanent, growing endowment for student aid that can be used for attendance at community colleges, four-year universities and for vocational training. The results will be more degrees, more training certificates and better jobs with higher wages. We can create a stronger future without an increase in taxes or a decrease in existing services. And this will benefit all Oregonians.

Great ideas like this do not come often. Let's seize this opportunity to make a real difference in the number of people who are able to access college and skills-based training.

If you believe that all kids deserve an education, join us in voting **Yes on Measure 86**.

(This information furnished by Charles McGee, Black Parent Initiative.)

Argument in Favor

We support the Oregon Opportunity Initiative, which is designed to bring more financial assistance to young Oregonians seeking higher education. The OSU Foundation is deeply involved in providing tuition assistance to Oregon students, and this initiative will further the state's involvement in the same worthy cause.

While the cost of providing a world-class college education continues to increase, our state government has spent 20 years slowly reducing its investment in Oregon's universities. The universities, in turn, have had to make up the difference through increased tuition. That's having a profound impact on young Oregonians. Between the 2004-2005 and 2011-2012 school years, tuition at Oregon's public universities increased 50%. When Oregon's Class of 2012 graduated from college, it was estimated that they carried an average of \$26,639 in debt. Each new graduate is entering a highly competitive job market that will challenge their near-term earning potential, while also carrying debt that may force delays in major life decisions like marriage, home ownership, or starting a family. We need to do more for young Oregonians, whom we all acknowledge are the key to our future success.

After years of dwindling state support for our public universities, the Opportunity Initiative is an innovative idea that has the potential to reverse this trend and make college more affordable. Accountability is a core value at Oregon State University, and we take our stewardship of human, fiscal and physical resources very seriously. That's why the OSU Foundation provides \$8 million in donor-funded tuition assistance to students each year. As a state, however, we need more action behind our words. We simply cannot profess to be supportive of public higher education while allowing our students to bear the financial burden of Oregon's divestment from universities. We have to speak with one voice by supporting the Opportunity Initiative.

(This information furnished by J. Michael Goodwin, President & CEO, Oregon State University Foundation.)

Argument in Opposition

Just Say No to Measure 86

- Bonds authorized by Measure 86 will not be paid off from investment earnings or by students who benefit from them, but by Oregon income taxpayers through the state general fund.
- Money used to pay off Measure 86 bonds will not be available to fund schools, prisons and social services.
- Based on ACT college admissions tests, only 30 percent of Oregon's 2014 high school graduates may be ready for college.

Don't spend more money on higher education until our public school system prepares most college-bound students to actually succeed there. Otherwise, we're just paying twice for remedial courses to teach college students what they should have learned in high school.

Why saddle Oregon taxpayers with perhaps \$100 million or more in debt for the next thirty years to subsidize a system in which many students simply aren't ready to be there? The answer is we shouldn't.

- Finally, listen to Measure 86 chief sponsor State Treasurer Ted Wheeler criticize the university system for being...

*"very slow to adapt the opportunities around technology. There's a lot of institutional inertia in the university system just as there is in Salem. And, all of these new technologies have opened up new windows to learning that do not require a student to even be in the same state."**

Treasurer Wheeler notes, for example, that the program iTunes U on his smartphone...

*"doesn't cost me a cent," is a "game changer," and "undercuts the entire economic model of the university system as it currently exists today."**

As technology drives down higher education costs, why saddle Oregon taxpayers with perhaps \$100 million or more in debt for the next thirty years to subsidize the old, high-cost economic model? Again, the answer is we shouldn't.

*** Video of Treasurer Wheeler's statement is online at: [youtube.com/watch?v=ZMPtmEyieg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZMPtmEyieg)**

More reasons to vote NO on Measure 86: cascadepolicy.org/links/4s

(This information furnished by Steve Buckstein, Cascade Policy Institute.)

Senate Joint Resolution 203 - Referred to the Electorate of Oregon by the Legislative Assembly of the 2014 Regular Session to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

87

Amends Constitution: Permits employment of state judges by National Guard (military service) and state public universities (teaching)

Estimate of Financial Impact	39
Text of Measure	40
Explanatory Statement	40
Legislative Argument in Support	40
Arguments in Favor	none
Arguments in Opposition	none

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote amends constitution to permit state judges to be employed by Oregon National Guard for military service purposes, state public universities for teaching purposes.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote retains existing constitutional restrictions on employment of Oregon state court judges by the Oregon National Guard and by the state public university system.

Summary

Article III, section 1, of Oregon Constitution (“separation of powers” clause) prohibits person from serving in more than one branch of government at the same time; Oregon Supreme Court has ruled that provision prohibits state court judges from teaching at institutions of public education. Article II, section 10, prohibits state court judges from being compensated for military service in National Guard. Measure amends constitution to authorize any public university as defined by law to employ state court judges for purpose of teaching at Oregon public universities. Measure also authorizes employment of state court judges by Oregon National Guard for purpose of military service. Measure provides that such educational or military employment shall not preclude person from serving as state judge at same time. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

There is no financial effect on either state or local government expenditures or revenues.

Text of Measure

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

PARAGRAPH 1. Senate Joint Resolution 34, Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly, 2013 Regular Session, is rescinded. The Secretary of State may not refer Senate Joint Resolution 34, Seventy-seventh Legislative Assembly, 2013 Regular Session, to the people for their approval or rejection at the next regular general election held throughout this state.

PARAGRAPH 2. The Constitution of the State of Oregon is amended by creating a new section 8a to be added to and made a part of Article XV, and by amending section 8, Article XV, such sections to read:

Sec. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, [article] Article III and section 10, [article] Article II of [the] this Constitution [of the State of Oregon,]:

(1) [a] A person employed by [the State Board of Higher Education,] any board or commission established by law to supervise and coordinate the activities of Oregon's institutions of post-secondary education, a person employed by a public university as defined by law or a member or employee of any school board [or employee thereof, shall be] is eligible to [a seat in] serve as a member of the Legislative Assembly, and [such] membership in the Legislative Assembly [shall] does not prevent [such] the person from being employed by [the State Board of Higher Education] any board or commission established by law to supervise and coordinate the activities of Oregon's post-secondary institutions of education or by a public university as defined by law, or from being a member or employee of a school board.

(2) A person serving as a judge of any court of this state may be employed by the Oregon National Guard for the purpose of performing military service or may be employed by any public university as defined by law for the purpose of teaching, and the employment does not prevent the person from serving as a judge.

SECTION 8a. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, if the amendment to section 8 of this Article proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 34 (2013) is approved by the people at the general election held on November 4, 2014, the amendment to section 8 of this Article by Senate Joint Resolution 34 (2013) shall not be effective and the amendment to section 8 of this Article proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 203 (2014) shall be effective in lieu thereof.

PARAGRAPH 3. The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the next regular general election held throughout this state.

Note: **Boldfaced** type indicates new language; [brackets and italic] type indicates deletions or comments.

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 87 would amend the Oregon Constitution to allow state court judges to be employed for the purpose of teaching at public universities and to receive compensation for performing military service in the Oregon National Guard.

Currently, Article III, section 1, of the Oregon Constitution (separation of powers clause), prohibits persons from serving in more than one branch of government at the same time. As one result of this prohibition, state court judges may not be employed as teachers at institutions of public education. Article II, section 10, of the Oregon Constitution, further prohibits state court judges from receiving compensation for performing military service.

Ballot Measure 87 also removes references to the State Board of Higher Education to reflect the current structure of higher education because of recent legislative changes. It also rescinds Senate Joint Resolution 34, which referred to the old structure of higher education.

Committee Members:

Senator Floyd Prozanski
Representative Phil Barnhart
Kathleen Beaufait
Jonathan Singer
Chip Lazenby

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Legislative Argument in Support

The Oregon Legislature approved Ballot Measure 87 as a technical fix to the state's constitution to allow state court judges to serve in the military and as teachers at public universities.

Oregon's constitution prohibits an individual from simultaneously serving in more than one branch of state government. (Article III, Section 1 – Separation of Powers clause.) Ballot Measure 87 will allow state court judges, a part of the judicial branch, to also serve the Oregon Military Department and Oregon's public universities, which are parts of the executive branch.

Currently, some state court judges volunteer as teachers at public universities and other judges serve in the Oregon National Guard. State court judges can be compensated by private schools and colleges for teaching, but currently state court judges cannot be paid by public schools.

Oregon Legislature determined that this disparity has led to fewer opportunities for students at Oregon's public universities to interact and learn from experienced jurists. Accordingly, in the interest of affording all of Oregon's students the same benefits, Ballot Measure 87 has been proposed to create equal opportunities at Oregon's public universities.

Ballot Measure 87 also clarifies that those judges who serve as members of the Oregon Military Department may do so.

Ballot Measure 87 will ensure that state court judges can be compensated as teachers at public universities and in the Oregon National Guard, without violating the Separation of Powers Clause of the state constitution. It also rescinds Senate Joint Resolution 34, which referred to the old structure of higher education.

The Oregon Legislature recommends a "yes" vote on Ballot Measure 87.

Committee Members:

Senator Floyd Prozanski
Representative Phil Barnhart
Representative Paul Holvey

Appointed by:

President of the Senate
Speaker of the House
Speaker of the House

(This Joint Legislative Committee was appointed to provide the legislative argument in support of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.245.)

Proposed by referendum petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

88

Provides Oregon resident “driver card” without requiring proof of legal presence in the United States

Estimate of Financial Impact	42
Text of Measure	42
Explanatory Statement	48
Arguments in Favor	49
Arguments in Opposition	57

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote directs Department of Transportation to issue “driver card” to Oregon resident meeting specified eligibility, without requiring proof of legal presence in United States.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote rejects law directing Department of Transportation to issue “driver card” to eligible Oregon resident without requiring proof of legal presence in United States.

Summary

Current law requires any applicant for an Oregon driver license or permit to provide proof of legal presence in the United States. Measure directs the Department of Transportation to issue a “driver card” to an applicant who does not provide proof of legal presence in the United States, but who has otherwise complied with all Oregon requirements for the type of driving privileges sought, has provided proof of residence in Oregon for more than one year, and has provided proof of identity and date of birth. The driver card may not be used as identification for air travel, to enter a federal building, to register to vote or to obtain any government benefit requiring proof of citizenship or lawful presence in United States. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

This measure will require the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to issue an Oregon Driver Card to an applicant without requiring the applicant to provide proof of legal presence in the United States, if that individual complies with all the requirements for the driving privileges to be sought; provides proof of identity and date of birth; (3) provides proof of residing in Oregon in excess of one year as of the date of the application; (4) provides a Social Security number (SSN) assigned to that individual by the United States Social Security Administration (SSA) or provides a written statement that the individual has not been assigned a SSN; and (5) pays any fees associated with the type of driver card being sought. The cost to provide these cards is estimated at \$2,794,802 in the 2013-15 biennium and \$2,677,144 in the 2015-17 biennium, but revenues are expected to be sufficient to offset these costs to ODOT. The revenue in excess of the costs will be deposited within the State Highway Fund.

The referendum establishes the following fees: (1) \$64 for issuance of a Class C driver card; (2) \$5 for the knowledge test for a Class C driver card; (3) \$9 for the skills test for a Class C driver card; (4) \$64 for issuance of a restricted Class C driver card; (5) \$44 for renewal of a Class C driver card; (6) \$30 for replacement of a Class C driver card; (7) \$6 for the Student Driver Training Fund; (8) \$75 for reinstatement of revoked driving privilege; (9) \$75 for reinstatement of suspended driving privileges; and (10) fee for reinstatement of the right to apply for driving privileges after a delay under ORS 809.280 (10) (1997 Edition), which is the same as the fee for reinstatement of suspended driving privileges.

The referendum provides that the fees charged for an Oregon Driver Card would be used for administrative purposes and distributed to the Highway Fund in the same manner as fees charged for an Oregon Driver License. It is anticipated that this measure will generate \$3,510,437 of revenue in 2013-15 and \$4,333,562 in 2015-17.

There are no anticipated effects on local government.

Text of Measure

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. Sections 2 to 5 of this 2013 Act are added to and made a part of the Oregon Vehicle Code.

SECTION 2. (1) Except as provided in this section, for the purposes of the Oregon Vehicle Code a driver card is subject to the same statutes and procedures that govern driver licenses and driver permits and shall be issued, renewed or replaced in the same manner as driver licenses or driver permits.

(2) The Department of Transportation shall issue, renew or replace a driver card without requiring a person to provide proof of legal presence in the United States if the person meets the requirements described in subsection (3) of this section.

(3) A person is eligible for a driver card under this section if the person:

(a) Complies with all of the requirements for the type of driving privileges sought to be issued, other than the requirement to provide proof of legal presence in the United States;

(b) Provides proof of identity and date of birth by submitting:

(A) An unexpired valid passport from the person's country of citizenship;

(B) An unexpired valid consular identification document issued by the consulate of the person's country of citizenship, if the department determines that the procedure used in issuing the consular identification document is sufficient to prove the person's identity; or

(C) Such other valid documentation, as defined by the department by rule;

(c) Provides proof of residency in this state in excess of one year as of the date of application;

(d) Provides the Social Security number assigned to the person by the United States Social Security Administration or provides a written statement that the person has not been assigned a Social Security number; and

(e) Pays the fees required under section 5 of this 2013 Act.

(4) The department may issue, renew or replace a driver card for an applicant who has submitted a Social Security number only after the department verifies the Social Security number with the United States Social Security Administration.

(5) A person may prove residency in this state in excess of one year by:

(a) Providing evidence that the person owns or leases property in Oregon for use as a personal domicile by the person;

(b) Providing evidence that the person filed a full-year resident or part-year resident Oregon tax return for the most recent tax year; or

(c) Demonstrating such other factors adopted by the department by rule.

(6) Notwithstanding ORS 807.130 and 807.150, upon issuance and renewal:

(a) A driver card issued under this section that is subject to the same requirements and issued in the same manner as

a driver license expires on the anniversary of the licensee's birthday in the fourth calendar year after the date of issuance.

(b) A driver card issued under this section that is subject to the same requirements and issued in the same manner as a driver permit is valid for the period of time for which a driver permit of the same type is issued by the department, but no longer than a period of four years.

(7) The department may not issue a commercial driver license to a person who holds a driver card issued under this section.

(8) The department shall adopt any rules the department considers necessary for the administration of this section.

SECTION 3. A driver card issued, renewed or replaced under section 2 of this 2013 Act must contain:

(1) The words "driver card" and may not contain the words "driver license" or "driver permit."

(2) A feature distinguishing the driver card from a driver license and driver permit. The form of the distinguishing feature shall be determined by the department by rule.

SECTION 4. A driver card issued, renewed or replaced under section 2 of this 2013 Act may be used only:

(1) To provide evidence of a grant of driving privileges.

(2) In the same manner as provided for driver licenses in ORS 97.951 to 97.982 for the purpose of identifying the person as an anatomical donor.

(3) To identify the person as an emancipated minor.

(4) To identify the person as a veteran.

(5) To provide a driver license number as required under ORS 18.042, 18.170 and 25.020.

(6) To provide a driver license number to aid a law enforcement agency in identifying a missing person under ORS 146.181.

SECTION 5. The following are the fees relating to the issuance, replacement and renewal of driver cards:

(1) Driver card issuance fee for a Class C driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$64.

(2) Fee to take the knowledge test for a Class C driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$5.

(3) Fee to take the skills test for a Class C driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$9.

(4) Driver card issuance fee for a restricted Class C driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$64.

(5) Driver card renewal fee for a Class C driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$44.

(6) Replacement fee for a driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$30.

(7) Student Driver Training Fund eligibility fee for a driver card issued under section 2 of this 2013 Act, \$6.

(8) Fee for reinstatement of revoked driving privileges under ORS 809.390, \$75.

(9) Fee for reinstatement of suspended driving privileges under ORS 809.380, \$75.

(10) Fee for reinstatement of right to apply for driving privileges after a delay under ORS 809.280 (10) (1997 Edition), the same as the fee for reinstatement of suspended driving privileges.

SECTION 6. ORS 807.310 is amended to read:

807.310. (1) The Department of Transportation shall provide for the issuance of applicant temporary driver permits in a manner consistent with this section.

(2) The department may issue an applicant temporary driver permit to an applicant for a driver license or for a driver permit while the department is determining all facts relative to application for the driver license or driver permit. The department shall set forth on the applicant temporary driver permit the driving privileges granted under the permit.

(3) The holder of an applicant temporary driver permit must have the temporary driver permit on the holder's person while operating a motor vehicle. The holder of an applicant temporary driver permit must operate within the driving privileges granted under the temporary driver permit.

(4) **Except as provided in subsection (5) of this section**, an applicant temporary driver permit is valid for a period of 30 days from the date issued. The department may extend the term of the permit for sufficient cause. An extension of the term of the permit may not exceed an additional 30 days.

(5) **An applicant temporary driver permit is valid for a period of 90 days from the date issued** if an applicant:

(a) Has complied with all the requirements for an application for a driver license or driver permit, except that the applicant is unable to produce the documentation required by the department under ORS 807.021 and 807.730[, *the department, at the time of application, may issue to the applicant an applicant temporary driver permit as provided in this section if the applicant*]; **and**

(b) Certifies that the applicant is, to the best of the applicant's knowledge, legally present in the United States.

(6) [*An applicant temporary driver permit issued to an applicant under subsection (5) of this section is valid for a period of 90 days from the date issued.*] The department may extend the term of [*the permit*] **an applicant temporary driver permit under subsection (5) of this section** up to two times for sufficient cause. Each extension of the term of the permit may not exceed 90 days.

(7) Notwithstanding subsection (6) of this section, the department may, in the manner provided by rule, further extend the term of the applicant temporary driver permit **under subsection (5) of this section** for an applicant who needs additional time to obtain the documentation required under ORS 807.021 and 807.730.

(8) An applicant temporary driver permit automatically becomes invalid if the applicant's license or permit is issued or refused for good cause.

(9) The department may not charge a fee for issuance of an applicant temporary driver permit under this section.

SECTION 7. ORS 807.130 is amended to read:

807.130. (1) A license that is issued as an original license and not as a license that is renewed expires on the anniversary of the licensee's birthday in the eighth calendar year after the year of issuance.

(2) A license that is renewed under ORS 807.150 expires eight years from the specified expiration date of the immediately preceding license.

(3) Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2) of this section, a **limited term driver** license that is issued **under ORS 807.730** to a person who is not a citizen or permanent legal resident of the United States expires on the date the licensee is no longer authorized to stay in the United States, as indicated by the documentation the person presented to the Department of Transportation to provide proof of legal presence in the United States as required by ORS 807.021 and 807.730, but no

longer than eight years from the date of issuance or, if there is no definite end to the authorized stay, after a period of one year.

(4) A license that has expired does not grant driving privileges and is not valid evidence of driving privileges.

SECTION 8. ORS 366.505 is amended to read:

366.505. (1) The State Highway Fund shall consist of:

(a) All moneys and revenues derived under and by virtue of the sale of bonds, the sale of which is authorized by law and the proceeds thereof to be dedicated to highway purposes.

(b) All moneys and revenues accruing from the licensing of motor vehicles, operators and chauffeurs.

(c) Moneys and revenues derived from any tax levied upon gasoline, distillate, liberty fuel or other volatile and inflammable liquid fuels, except moneys and revenues described in ORS 184.642 (2)(a) that become part of the Department of Transportation Operating Fund.

(d) Moneys and revenues derived from or made available by the federal government for road construction, maintenance or betterment purposes.

(e) All moneys derived from the issuance of driver cards.

[(e)] **(f)** All moneys and revenues received from all other sources which by law are allocated or dedicated for highway purposes.

(2) The highway fund shall be deemed and held as a trust fund, separate and distinct from the General Fund, and may be used only for the purposes authorized by law and is continually appropriated for such purposes.

(3) Moneys in the State Highway Fund may be invested as provided in ORS 293.701 to 293.820. All interest earnings on any of the funds designated in subsection (1) of this section shall be placed to the credit of the highway fund.

SECTION 9. ORS 367.173 is amended to read:

367.173. The principal, interest, premium, if any, and the purchase or tender price of the grant anticipation revenue bonds issued under ORS 367.161 to 367.181 are payable solely from the following moneys:

(1) Federal transportation funds.

(2) To the extent affirmatively pledged at the time issuance of revenue bonds is authorized, the following moneys that are lawfully available:

(a) Moneys deposited in the State Highway Fund established under ORS 366.505.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this subsection, moneys, once deposited in the State Highway Fund established under ORS 366.505, from the following sources may be affirmatively pledged:

(A) Moneys from the taxes and fees on motor carriers imposed under ORS 825.474 and 825.480.

(B) Moneys from the tax on motor vehicle fuel imposed under ORS 319.020.

(C) Moneys from the tax on fuel used in motor vehicles imposed under ORS 319.530.

(D) Moneys described under ORS 803.090 from the titling of vehicles.

(E) Moneys described under ORS 803.420 from the registration of vehicles.

(F) Moneys described under ORS 807.370 relating to the

issuance of driver licenses and driver permits.

(G) Moneys described under section 5 of this 2013 Act relating to issuance of driver cards.

[[G]] **(H)** Moneys received by the Department of Transportation from taxes, fees or charges imposed after January 1, 2001, or other revenues or moneys received by the department from sources not listed in subparagraphs (A) to [(F)] **(G)** of this paragraph that are lawfully available to be pledged under this section.

(c) Moneys described in paragraph (b) of this subsection do not include:

(A) Moneys provided for appropriations to counties under ORS 366.762 to 366.768.

(B) Moneys provided for appropriations to cities under ORS 366.785 to 366.820.

(C) Moneys in the account established under ORS 366.512 for parks and recreation.

SECTION 10. ORS 367.605 is amended to read:

367.605. (1) Moneys deposited in the State Highway Fund established under ORS 366.505 are pledged to payment of Highway User Tax Bonds issued under ORS 367.615.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (3) of this section, moneys, once deposited in the highway fund from the following sources are subject to the use or pledge described in subsection (1) of this section:

(a) Moneys from the taxes and fees on motor carriers imposed under ORS 825.474 and 825.480.

(b) Moneys from the tax on motor vehicle fuel imposed under ORS 319.020.

(c) Moneys from the tax on fuel used in motor vehicles imposed under ORS 319.530.

(d) Moneys described under ORS 803.090 from the titling of vehicles.

(e) Moneys described under ORS 803.420 from the registration of vehicles.

(f) Moneys described under ORS 807.370 relating to the issuance of driver licenses and driver permits.

(g) Moneys described under section 5 of this 2013 Act relating to the issuance of driver cards.

[[g]] **(h)** Moneys received by the Department of Transportation from taxes, fees or charges imposed after January 1, 2001, or other revenues received by the department from sources not listed in paragraphs (a) to [(f)] **(g)** of this subsection that are available for the use or pledge described by this section.

(3) Moneys described under subsection (2) of this section do not include:

(a) Moneys provided for appropriations to counties under ORS 366.762 to 366.768.

(b) Moneys provided for appropriations to cities under ORS 366.785 to 366.820.

(c) Moneys in the account established under ORS 366.512 for parks and recreation.

(4) To the extent affirmatively pledged, moneys from the following sources are subject to the use or pledge described in subsection (1) of this section:

(a) Moneys received by the Department of Transportation from the United States government.

(b) Any other moneys legally available to the department.

(5) Notwithstanding ORS 366.507, the lien or charge of any pledge of moneys securing bonds issued under ORS 367.615 is superior or prior to any other lien or charge and to any law of the state requiring the department to spend moneys for specified highway purposes.

SECTION 11. ORS 802.110 is amended to read:

802.110. Any procedures the Department of Transportation establishes for financial administration of those functions of the department dealing with driver and motor vehicle services and for the disposition and payment of moneys it receives from the provision of driver and motor vehicle services shall comply with all of the following:

(1) The department shall deposit all moneys it receives related to driver and motor vehicle services in the Department of Transportation Driver and Motor Vehicle Suspense Account for approved expenses and disbursements before payment of general administrative expenses of the department related to the provision of driver and motor vehicle services. Notwithstanding this subsection, the department may return a bank check or money order when received in incorrect or incomplete form or when not accompanied by the proper application.

(2) The department shall pay the following approved expenses and disbursements from the Department of Transportation Driver and Motor Vehicle Suspense Account before payment of the general administrative expenses of the department related to driver and motor vehicle services:

(a) Refunds authorized by any statute administered by the department when such refunds are approved by the department.

(b) Amounts transferred to the State Treasurer under ORS 319.410 (2) for the purpose of carrying out the state aviation laws, amounts transferred to the Boating Safety, Law Enforcement and Facility Account by ORS 319.415, amounts transferred to the State Aviation Account by ORS 319.417 and amounts transferred to the Department of Transportation Operating Fund by ORS 184.643.

(c) After deduction of expenses of collection, transfer and administration, the department shall pay moneys collected from the Student Driver Training Fund eligibility fee under ORS 807.040, 807.150 and 807.370 **and section 5 of this 2013 Act** to the State Treasurer for deposit in the Student Driver Training Fund. The moneys deposited in the Student Driver Training Fund under this paragraph are continuously appropriated to the department for the following purposes:

(A) To the extent of not more than 10 percent of the amount transferred into the Student Driver Training Fund in any biennium, to pay the expenses of administering ORS 336.795, 336.800, 336.805, 336.810 (2) and 336.815.

(B) The remaining moneys, for reimbursing school districts and commercial driver training schools as provided under ORS 336.805.

(d) After deduction of expenses of collection, transfer and administration, the department shall pay moneys collected for the Motorcycle Safety Subaccount under ORS 807.170 to the State Treasurer for deposit in the Motorcycle Safety Subaccount of the Transportation Safety Account. Moneys paid to the State Treasurer under this paragraph shall be used for the purpose of ORS 802.320.

(e) After deduction of expenses for the administration of the issuance of customized registration plates under ORS 805.240, the department shall place moneys received from the sale of customized registration plates in the Passenger Rail Transportation Account. The moneys placed in the account are continuously appropriated to the department and shall be used for the payment of expenses incurred in administering passenger rail programs.

(f) After deduction of expenses of collection, transfer and administration, the department shall pay moneys from any registration fees established by the governing bodies of counties or a district, as defined in ORS 801.237, under ORS 801.041 or 801.042 to the appropriate counties or districts. The department shall make the payments on at least a monthly basis unless another basis is established by the intergovernmental agreements required by ORS 801.041 and 801.042 between the department and the governing bodies of a county or a district.

(g) After deducting the expenses of the department in collecting and transferring the moneys, the department shall make disbursements and payments of moneys collected for or dedicated to any other purpose or fund except the State Highway Fund, including but not limited to, payments to the Department of Transportation Operating Fund established by ORS 184.642 (1) and (2).

(3) The department shall refund from the Department of Transportation Driver and Motor Vehicle Suspense Account any excess or erroneous payment to a person who made the payment or to the person's legal representative when the department determines that money has been received by it in excess of the amount legally due and payable or that it has received money in which it has no legal interest. Refunds payable under this subsection are continuously appropriated for such purposes in the manner for payment of refunds under this section. If the department determines that a refund is due, the department may refund the amount of excess or erroneous payment without a claim being filed. Except as provided in ORS 319.290, 319.375, 319.820 and 319.831, any claim for a refund from the department must be filed within 12 months after the date payment is received by the department.

(4) After payment of those expenses and disbursements approved for payment before general administrative expenses related to the provision of driver and motor vehicle services, the department shall pay from the Department of Transportation Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Administrative Account its general administrative expenses incurred in the administration of any law related to driver and motor vehicle services that the department is charged with administering and any other expenses the department is permitted by law to pay from moneys held by the department before transfer of the moneys to the State Highway Fund. The following limitations apply to payments of administrative expenses under this subsection:

(a) The department shall make payment of the expenses of administering the issuance of winter recreation parking permits under ORS 811.595 from those moneys received from issuing the permits.

(b) The department shall pay its expenses for administering the registration and titling of snowmobiles under ORS 821.060 and 821.100 from the fees collected from administering those sections. The department shall also pay its expenses for the administration of the snowmobile driver permit program under ORS 821.160 from the moneys otherwise described in this paragraph.

(c) The department shall pay its expenses for determining the amount of money to be withheld under ORS 802.120 from the fees collected for administering the registration and titling of snowmobiles. The amount used to pay expenses under this paragraph shall be such sum as necessary but shall not exceed \$10,000 during each biennium.

(d) The department shall retain not more than \$15,000 in any biennium for the expenses of collecting and transferring moneys to the Student Driver Training Fund under this section and for the administration of ORS 336.810 (3).

(5) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the department shall transfer to the State Highway Fund the moneys not used for payment of the general administrative

expenses or for approved expenses and disbursements before payment of general administrative expenses. The following apply to this subsection:

(a) If the Director of Transportation certifies the amount of principal or interest of highway bonds due on any particular date, the department may make available for the payment of such interest or principal any sums that may be necessary to the extent of moneys on hand available for the State Highway Fund regardless of the dates otherwise specified under this section.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) of this subsection the department shall not make available for purposes described in paragraph (a) of this subsection any moneys described in ORS 367.605 when there are not sufficient amounts of such moneys in the State Highway Fund for purposes of bonds issued under ORS 367.615.

(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the following moneys shall be transferred to the State Highway Fund at the times described:

(a) Moneys received under ORS 802.120 and not used for the payment of administrative expenses of the department shall be transferred before July 31 of each year.

(b) Moneys received from the registration of snowmobiles that is not to be used for payment of administrative expenses of the department shall be transferred within 30 days after the end of the quarter.

(c) Moneys received from the issuance of winter recreation parking permits that is not used for payment of administrative expenses of the department shall be transferred within 30 days after the end of the quarter.

(7) The following moneys transferred to the State Highway Fund under this section may be used only for the purposes described as follows:

(a) Moneys collected from the issuance of winter recreation parking permits, and the interest on such moneys, shall be used to enforce the requirement for winter recreation parking permits and to remove snow from winter recreation parking locations designated under ORS 810.170. Any remaining moneys shall, upon approval by the Winter Recreation Advisory Committee:

(A) Be used to maintain parking locations developed with moneys obtained under ORS 810.170 and snowmobile facilities that are parking lots developed with moneys as provided under this section;

(B) Be used to develop additional winter recreation parking locations under ORS 810.170; or

(C) Be carried over to be used in subsequent years for the purposes and in the manner described in this paragraph.

(b) Moneys received from the registration of snowmobiles or under ORS 802.120 may be used for development and maintenance of multiuse trails within urban growth boundaries described in ORS 367.017 or for the development and maintenance of snowmobile facilities, including the acquisition of land therefor by any means other than the exercise of eminent domain. Moneys received under ORS 802.120 may also be used for the enforcement of ORS 811.590, 821.100 to 821.120, 821.140, 821.150, 821.190, 821.210 and 821.240 to 821.290.

(8) The department shall maintain the Revolving Account for Emergency Cash Advances separate from other moneys described in this section. From the account, the department may pay for the taking up of dishonored remittances returned by banks or the State Treasurer and for emergency cash advances to be subsequently reimbursed. The account shall be used only as a revolving fund. The department shall at all times be accountable for the amount of the account, either

in cash or unreimbursed items and advances. The moneys in the account are continuously appropriated for the purposes of this subsection. The amount of the account under this subsection shall not exceed \$40,000 from moneys received by the department in the performance of its driver and motor vehicle services functions and moneys otherwise appropriated for purposes of this subsection. The account under this subsection shall be kept on deposit with the State Treasurer. The State Treasurer is authorized to honor and pay all properly signed and indorsed checks or warrants drawn against the account.

SECTION 12. ORS 802.160 is amended to read:

802.160. The fees collected under ORS 807.370 and **section 5 of this 2013 Act** for the reinstatement of suspended and revoked driving privileges shall be applied by the Department of Transportation to the cost of preparing and serving notices of suspension or revocation and to the cost of administering the driver improvement program authorized under ORS 809.480.

SECTION 13. ORS 807.375 is amended to read:

807.375. (1) In addition to any fee imposed under ORS 807.370 and 807.410 or **section 5 of this 2013 Act**, the Department of Transportation may impose a fee for each driver license, driver permit, **driver card** and identification card that is issued, renewed or replaced, for the purpose of covering the costs of purchasing equipment and establishing and maintaining a database used for collecting and verifying biometric data.

(2) A fee imposed under this section may not be more than \$3 per driver license, driver permit, **driver card** or identification card.

SECTION 14. ORS 802.200 is amended to read:

802.200. In addition to any other records the Department of Transportation may establish, the department is subject to the following provisions concerning records:

(1) The department shall maintain records concerning the titling of vehicles in this state. The records under this subsection shall include the following:

(a) For vehicles issued a title by this state, the records shall identify the vehicle and contain the following:

(A) The name of the vehicle owner and any security interest holders in order of priority, except that a security interest holder need not be identified if the debtor who granted the interest is in the business of selling vehicles and the vehicles constitute inventory held for sale;

(B) The name of any lessor of the vehicle;

(C) The vehicle description; and

(D) Whether a certificate of title was issued for the vehicle.

(b) If the vehicle is an antique vehicle that is reconstructed, the records shall indicate that the vehicle is reconstructed.

(c) If the vehicle is a replica, the records shall indicate that the vehicle is a replica.

(d) Any other information concerning the titling of vehicles that the department considers convenient or appropriate.

(e) All odometer readings for a vehicle that are reported to the department under provisions of the vehicle code.

(f) If the vehicle has been reported to the department as a totaled vehicle under the provisions of ORS 819.012 or 819.014, the records shall indicate that the vehicle is a totaled vehicle unless the reason for the report was theft and the vehicle has been recovered.

(2) If a vehicle that has been registered or titled in another

jurisdiction is registered or titled in this state, the department shall retain a record of any odometer readings shown on the title or registration documents submitted to the department at the time of registration or title.

(3) Except as otherwise provided in ORS 826.003, the department shall maintain records concerning the registration of vehicles required to be registered by the department. The records concerning the registration of vehicles may be stored along with records concerning the titling of vehicles. The records under this subsection shall include the following:

(a) For vehicles registered by the department, the records shall identify the vehicle and contain the following:

(A) The registration plate number assigned by the department to the vehicle;

(B) The name of the vehicle owner;

(C) The vehicle description and vehicle identification number; and

(D) An indication that the vehicle is a totaled vehicle if it has been reported to the department as a totaled vehicle under the provisions of ORS 819.012 or 819.014, unless the reason for the report was theft and the vehicle has been recovered.

(b) Any other information concerning the registration of vehicles that the department considers convenient or appropriate.

(4) The department shall maintain separate records for the regulation of vehicle dealers. The records required under this subsection shall include the following information about persons issued dealer certificates:

(a) The person's application for a vehicle dealer certificate.

(b) An alphabetical index of the name of each person applying for a vehicle dealer certificate.

(c) A numerical index according to the distinctive number assigned to each vehicle dealer.

(5) The department shall maintain a file on vehicles for which the title record is canceled under ORS 819.030. The records required under this subsection shall disclose the last registered owner of each vehicle, any security interest holder or holders and lessors of each vehicle as shown by the canceled title record for each vehicle and the make and year model for each vehicle.

(6) The department shall maintain a record of each agreement or declaration under ORS 802.500 and 802.520.

(7) The department shall maintain separate and comprehensive records of all transactions affecting the Revolving Account for Emergency Cash Advances described under ORS 802.100.

(8) The department shall maintain suitable records of driver licenses, driver permits, **driver cards** and identification cards. The records required under this subsection shall include all of the following:

(a) An index by name and number.

(b) Supporting documentation of all driver licenses, driver permits, **driver cards** or identification cards issued.

(c) Every application for a driver license, driver permit, **driver card** or identification card.

(d) All driver licenses [or], driver permits **or driver cards** that have been suspended or revoked.

(e) **Except as provided in paragraph (f) of this subsection,** for each driver license, driver permit or identification card, the Social Security number of the person to whom the driver license, driver permit or identification card is issued or proof that the person is not eligible for a Social Security number.

(f) For each driver card, the Social Security number of the person to whom the driver card is issued or a written statement that the person has not been assigned a Social Security number.

[(f)] (g) For each commercial driver license, the Social Security number of the person to whom the license is issued, or any other number or identifying information that the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation determines appropriate to identify the person.

(9) The Department of Transportation shall maintain a two-part driving record consisting of an employment driving record and a nonemployment driving record for each person as required under this subsection. All of the following apply to the records required under this subsection:

(a) The department shall maintain driving records on:

(A) Every person who is granted driving privileges under a driver license, driver permit, **driver card** or a statutory grant of driving privileges under ORS 807.020;

(B) Every person whose driving privileges have been suspended, revoked or canceled under this vehicle code;

(C) Every person who has filed an accident report under ORS 811.725 or 811.730; and

(D) Every person who is required to provide future responsibility filings under ORS 806.200, 806.220, 806.230 or 806.240.

(b) In addition to other information required by this paragraph, the employment driving record shall include all reports of drug test results that are made to the department under ORS 825.410. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, release of the portion of the employment driving record that shows drug test results reported under ORS 825.410 is permitted only in accordance with ORS 802.202. The employment driving record shall also include all motor vehicle accidents that the person is required to report under ORS 811.720, all suspensions of driving privileges required to be placed on the record under ORS 809.280, all suspensions of the person's commercial driver license that result from operation or use of a commercial motor vehicle and all convictions of the person for violation of motor vehicle laws except convictions for offenses requiring mandatory revocation or suspension of driving privileges under ORS 809.409, 809.411, 809.413 and 813.400, but shall include only such accidents, suspensions and convictions that occur while the person is driving a motor vehicle:

(A) In the course of the person's employment when the person is employed by another for the principal purpose of driving a motor vehicle;

(B) Carrying persons or property for compensation;

(C) In the course of the person's employment in the collection, transportation or delivery of mail if the vehicle is government owned or marked for the collection, transportation or delivery of mail in accordance with government rules;

(D) That is an authorized emergency vehicle;

(E) That is a commercial motor vehicle; or

(F) In the course of the person's employment with a federal, state or local government in a public works project involving repair or maintenance of water, sewer or road systems.

(c) The nonemployment driving record shall include the person's:

(A) Motor vehicle accidents that the person is required to report under ORS 811.720, other than the motor vehicle accidents that are included on the person's employment driving record;

(B) Suspensions, cancellations and revocations of licenses,

permits and driving privileges;

(C) Convictions for violation of the motor vehicle laws other than those included in the employment driving record including, for each violation of ORS 811.100 or 811.111, the speed at which the person was convicted of traveling and the posted speed, the speed limit or the speed that constitutes prima facie evidence of violation of the basic speed rule, as appropriate; and

(D) Diversion agreements entered into under ORS 813.220 within the preceding 15 years.

(d) The department may record other entries to indicate correspondence, interviews, participation in driver improvement programs or other matters concerning the status of the driving privileges of the person.

(e) When a person from another jurisdiction applies for a driver license or driver permit issued by this state, the department shall request a copy of the person's driving record from the other jurisdiction. At the time the person is issued a license in Oregon, the record from the other jurisdiction shall become part of the driver's record in this state with the same force and effect as though entered on the driver's record in this state in the original instance. The department by rule may specify methods for converting entries from out-of-state records for use in Oregon.

(f) When a suspension of a driver permit, driver license or other driving privilege is placed on the driving record under ORS 809.280 for failure to appear in court on a traffic crime, the department shall note on the record that the suspension was for failure to appear in court and shall also note the offense charged against the person on which the person failed to appear.

(g) The Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Department of State Police, shall devise and implement a method of noting suspensions and revocations of driving privileges on the record in such a way that police agencies can determine directly from the record what class of offense, as provided by law, is committed by a person who drives in violation of the suspension or revocation. If the Department of Transportation and the Department of State Police devise a mutually agreeable alternative method of informing police agencies of the nature of a suspension or revocation and the consequences of its violation, the implementation of that method shall satisfy the duty of the Department of Transportation under this paragraph.

(10) The Department of Transportation shall maintain records of judgments or convictions sent to the department under ORS 810.375.

(11) The department shall maintain accident reports filed with the department under ORS 810.460 and 811.725 to 811.735.

(12) The department shall maintain records of bank checks or money orders returned under ORS 802.110.

(13) The department shall maintain records of trip permits issued by the department under ORS 803.600, as provided under this subsection. The records required by this subsection shall include the following:

(a) A description of the vehicle sufficient to identify the vehicle.

(b) The person to whom the permit was issued.

(c) When the permit was issued.

(d) The type of permit issued.

(e) For registration weight trip permits, the maximum allowable registration weight permitted for operation under the permit.

(f) Any other information the department determines appropriate or convenient.

SECTION 15. Notwithstanding any other law limiting expenditures, the amount of \$4,708,505 is established for the biennium beginning July 1, 2013, as the maximum limit for payment of expenses for the purpose of carrying out section 2 of this 2013 Act from fees, moneys or other revenues, including Miscellaneous Receipts, but excluding lottery funds and federal funds, collected or received by the Department of Transportation under section 5 of this 2013 Act.

Note: **Boldfaced** type indicates new language; *[brackets and italic]* type indicates deletions or comments.

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 88 amends the Oregon Vehicle Code to allow the state in certain circumstances to issue limited purpose driver cards to Oregon residents as proof of driving privileges.

The Oregon Vehicle Code currently prohibits the Department of Transportation from granting a driver license or driver permit to any person unless that person provides proof of legal presence in the United States.

The proposed measure directs the Department of Transportation to issue a driver card to an applicant who complies with all current requirements for the type of driving privileges sought and provides proof of residence in Oregon for more than one year, without requiring a person to provide proof of legal presence in the United States. A driver card is valid for four years.

The measure provides that the driver card must not indicate that it is a driver license or driver permit and must include a distinguishing feature that identifies the card as a driver card. Additionally, the measure prohibits the Department of Transportation from issuing a commercial driver license to a person who holds a driver card.

Currently, a person who holds a driver permit or driver license may use the permit or license as proof of identity and age. A person with a driver card may use the card only as evidence of driving privileges. The measure provides limited exceptions to this restriction. A person could use a driver card to designate that the person is an organ donor, an emancipated minor or a veteran, or to establish identity for certain civil proceedings or missing person investigations.

Committee Members:	Appointed by:
Cynthia Kendall	Chief Petitioners
Representative Kim Thatcher	Chief Petitioners
Elizabeth Remley	Secretary of State
Becky Straus	Secretary of State
Edwin Peterson	Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Argument in Favor

Working Families is fighting for a brighter future for ALL Oregonians

One where the economy works for everyone, not just the wealthy and well-connected. One where politicians are accountable to working people, instead of Wall Street lobbyists and corporate CEOs. One where all of us, no matter where we come from, can find a good job, get health care when we need it, afford a home, send our kids to good schools, and have a secure retirement.

That's why Working Families supports Measure 88, Oregon Safe Roads. Thousands of Oregonians who received drivers licenses before law changes in 2007 are unable to renew their licenses, and there are many Oregonians who are not eligible for a traditional driver's license, including seniors who were born without, or have lost, their birth certificate, veterans with a military ID, and undocumented workers. These Oregonians will benefit from a limited purpose driver card, allowing them to safely and legally get to work, church and school.

The health of our economy depends on the thousands of Oregon working families that are kept from driving their kids to school or getting to work legally. Withholding driving privileges has not made our roads safer, on the contrary, uninsured and unlicensed drivers have increased while Oregon taxpayers pay to enforce a law that is costly and unnecessary.

Working Families supports driver cards for working Oregonians who pass the State's written and behind-the-wheel driver test, as well as follow current Oregon law regarding proof of insurance. Support Measure 88, Oregon Safe Roads.

(This information furnished by Cherry A Harris, Treasurer, Oregon Working Families Party.)

Argument in Favor

A person's privilege to drive on public roads should be contingent **only** upon their ability to use those roads safely and without excessive risk to others – for example, by demonstrating driving competency through a test and by having insurance and a safe driving history.

The motivation to deny driving privileges to illegal immigrants is to make it more difficult for them to live here. It's an incentive for them to leave.

If we accept the principle of denying driving privileges to certain lawbreakers, how far could we take it? We could make life less comfortable for all manner of scoundrels! We should surely start with convicted felons. Petty thieves, too – they can find somewhere else to live! We could also go after dead-beat dads who are behind on their child support payments. We don't want those kinds of people living in Oregon, right? If they can't drive here, they'll leave!

But that is obviously illegitimate. The purpose of government is to protect individual rights – not to make everyday life as difficult as possible for people that "society" doesn't like!

Driving privileges should not be encumbered by unrelated goals like the enforcement of immigration laws.

Certainly, there are flaws in this bill. The key problem is that it creates an obviously different type of identification than a regular driver license, creating the risk that people using a driver card may be subject to additional suspicion, harassment, or other hardship based on the reasonable assumption that they are violating immigration laws. Importantly, the state's database of driver card holders would be valuable data for federal immigration law enforcement, who might seize it.

It would have been much better to have a single form of driver identification for everyone.

On the whole, however, I believe the benefits of this bill outweigh its problems. Driving privileges should not be coupled with immigration status. These are separate concerns that should be treated separately by the law.

(This information furnished by Kyle Markley.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Businesses for Measure 88

The Oregon Business Association strongly urges a YES vote on this common sense driver card measure.

Predictability and stability are key for any business to succeed, yet many members of our workforce are being denied the ability to legally drive a vehicle. These Oregonians work hard and pay their taxes. **For Oregon businesses to be successful, they need to be assured that their employees can drive safely and legally to and from work.**

Voting YES will allow the state to issue driver cards to any Oregon resident who:

- Passes the State's written driver knowledge test.
- Passes the State's behind-the-wheel driver test.
- Provides proof of residence in Oregon for more than one year.
- Provides proof of identity and date of birth.

A driver card will help our workers follow the law and improve safety for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians by reducing the number of uninsured and untested drivers on the road.

Join Oregon's Employers in Voting YES on Measure 88 – a Driver Card for all qualified Oregonians

(This information furnished by Ryan Deckert, Oregon Business Association.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Landscape Contractors Association: Yes on 88

The Oregon Landscape Contractors Association (OLCA) endorses a YES on Measure 88 because we believe:

1. All Oregonians need a safe, legal way to get to work, church and school.
2. All Oregonians deserve safe roads, with tested and insured drivers.
3. Oregon's economy depends on workers' ability to safely and legally drive to their jobs.

Measure 88 will create a limited and conditional Driver Card. This will ensure that all Oregon drivers on the road are tested and insured. The Driver Card only shows proof of driving competency, and cannot be used for any privileges or access requiring proof of citizenship.

OLCA's mission is to promote the growth and well-being of the landscape industry. Measure 88 is a smart, common-sense policy that will help many sectors of Oregon's economy grow as needed, while keeping our roads safer for everyone.

Please join us to vote Yes on Measure 88.

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Labor Groups Agree: Yes on Measure 88

Measure 88 as a common sense policy that benefits Oregon workers around the state.

There are thousands of Oregonians who, for an array of reasons, are ineligible for a traditional driver license.

Measure 88 would create a conditional driver card for Oregon residents to provide an alternative path for licensure and insurance.

We urge you to vote YES on Measure 88 so that all eligible Oregonians can safely and legally drive to work.

This is about equal opportunity for all Oregonians. We should not deny any working Oregonian the access they need to support themselves and their families.

Measure 88 is Good for Oregon and Good for Oregon Workers!

AFSCME Council 75

Oregon AFL-CIO

SEIU Local 49

SEIU Local 503

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Small Businesses Support Measure 88

For years, small businesses have been urging action on comprehensive immigration reform to strengthen our workforce and economy. But while Congress has failed to act again and again, Oregon now has an opportunity to do things our way, in our state.

Measure 88 is a common-sense, Oregon response to a crisis that Congress won't fix.

Providing a safe and legal way for all Oregonians to drive is good for Oregon's economy and all Oregonians.

- **Measure 88 means safer roads.** By making sure all drivers on the road have passed driving tests and hold insurance, we can reduce accidents and hit-and-runs.
- **Measure 88 means a stronger economy.** With a Driver Card option to get all Oregonians to work and the grocery store, we can improve and expand our economy. A Driver Card option increases our workforce, puts more customers in our stores, and results in more income and property taxpayers.
- **Measure 88 means a stronger workforce.** Many business sectors, including farming and agriculture, suffer greatly by current laws that deny some Oregonians a safe and legal option to drive to work. These industries require a growing workforce that is not being met.

When small businesses thrive, all of Oregon thrives. Measure 88 is good for workers, businesses, and our state's economy.

Please join us to vote Yes on Measure 88.

Main Street Alliance of Oregon

Tu Casa Real Estate

Jim Gilbert, Northwoods Nursery/One Green World

Intratel Interpreting & Translation

Latino Business Alliance

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

League of Women Voters Encourage a YES on Measure 88

A Driver Card for Safe Roads

Measure 88 is a common sense approach to keep our communities safe, by creating a **limited purpose** and **limited**

duration Driver Card for qualified applicants living and working in Oregon.

Get the Facts: What does this measure really do?

A driver card will help Oregon residents follow the law and improve safety for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians by reducing the number of uninsured and untested drivers on the road.

Seniors, refugees, and immigrant families and workers are among the thousands of Oregonians who need this option to get to work, church and school.

To get a driver card, Oregon residents have to pass a written test, a behind-the-wheel driver test and provide proof of residence, identity and date of birth.

Get the Facts: What does this measure NOT do?

The Driver Card **may not be used** as identification for air travel, to enter a federal building, to register to vote, or to obtain any government benefit requiring proof of citizenship or lawful presence in United States

Vote YES on 88

All Oregonians should be able to safely and legally get to work, church, and school. Vote YES to allow all Oregonians to get where they need to go and to keep our roads and communities safe by reducing the number of unlicensed and uninsured drivers.

League of Women Voters of Oregon

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

A Message from Congressman Earl Blumenauer

Vote Yes on Measure 88

Dear Fellow Oregonian:

The refusal of House GOP leadership to reform our hopeless broken immigration system means millions of hardworking immigrants are trapped in limbo. They may not be documented but many of their family members are US citizens and we depend on their many contributions to our economy.

Let's not add to the political paralysis surrounding the reform of our immigration laws.

It's simple. If you drive a car in Oregon, you should prove that you can drive and have insurance.

That's why I'm voting yes on Measure 88!

We are far better off testing, certifying and knowing who is driving on our roads.

This common sense step of issuing a driving card to qualified drivers will make us all safer.

Oregon farms, vineyards, nurseries and other small businesses depend on these workers, many of whom have not just jobs, but families in Oregon who are legal citizens.

Let's not hold them and our farmers, ranchers, and wine-maker's hostage.

Take action to protect Oregon small businesses, particularly in rural communities while we work for national solutions that will actually improve the economy and reduce the deficit.

Let's stop the merry-go-round and finger pointing by bringing people out of the shadows.

Measure 88 will take a small significant step.

Sincerely,

Earl Blumenauer
Congressman, Oregon's 3rd Congressional District

(This information furnished by Earl Blumenauer, Congressman.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Public Health Professionals Voting Yes for Driver Cards

Being able to drive safely and legally is a public health issue of concern to all of us. Assuring that people have the means to access health care, work, schools, and community services is an issue of equity in our state.

As health workers and guardians of the public health, we are aware of the needs of the families and communities we serve.

As health care practitioners, every day, our exam rooms are visited by Oregonians needing medical assistance, and we are there to help them.

Unfortunately, we can't treat those who can't get to us.

We know there are many Oregonians, including children, who are afraid or unable to visit us for the check-ups, and receive the care they need to stay healthy and contribute to our society.

Those of us in public health work to build strong, healthy and safe communities. No person should be denied the opportunity to drive in a legal and safe manner. When that opportunity is not there, it makes our neighborhoods and roads less safe for everyone.

By voting "Yes" for driver cards, we give Oregonians a safe and legal way to:

- **Get to their medical appointments;**
- **Receive routine preventive care, reducing expensive costs further down the road;**
- **Take their sick children to a health care provider or emergency room;**
- **Travel to help an ailing or elderly parent.**
- **Maintain family stability through being able to get to work and transport children safely.**

Please join us in keeping our communities safe and healthy by voting "Yes" on Measure 88.

Oregon Public Health Association

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Family Farmers are Voting YES on Measure 88

Yes on 88: Maintains State Responsibility

Measure 88 is about one thing: Giving all Oregonians the chance to demonstrate the knowledge and ability to drive safely. Driver testing and rules of the road are state obligations, and Measure 88 improves Oregon's ability to fulfill these responsibilities. Measure 88 does not affect federal policies, nor create any new, non-driving privileges.

Yes on 88: For Safer Roads

Every Oregon driver should have the knowledge and skills to drive safely. Measure 88 ensures this by requiring that all motorists be tested and approved before driving.

Yes on 88: Fewer Uninsured Drivers in Oregon

All Oregonians pay the costs of uninsured motorists. Passing Measure 88 removes a substantial barrier that prohibits many Oregon drivers from getting the insurance they want and need. When more Oregonians have access to auto insurance, all Oregonians benefit.

Yes on 88: For Oregon Working Families

Working Oregonians need the ability to drive legally. In particular, those living in rural areas away from public transportation have no way to get to work, take care of family members or perform other basic responsibilities. Measure 88 gives drivers more responsibility by requiring a driver test and by allowing them to obtain insurance before operating a vehicle.

It is time to remove barriers to auto insurance and safe, knowledgeable driving privileges for all Oregonians. It is time to vote YES on Measure 88.

Oregon Farm Bureau Federation

(This information furnished by Barry Bushue, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.)

Argument in Favor

Local Leaders Urge You to Vote YES on Measure 88

Measure 88 is needed because partisan gridlock back in Washington, D.C. has repeatedly failed to address our broken immigration system. Just a few weeks ago, Congress announced it has no intention of even trying to fix our immigration mess this year.

Oregon Can't Wait

Instead of waiting for politicians in Congress to act, we have the chance to implement a common-sense fix that will make our roads and communities safer.

Undocumented Oregonians are our neighbors, co-workers and friends. They work hard and pay millions of dollars in taxes—including gas taxes (used to repair roads)—that flow into Oregon's budget. Despite this, they are denied safe, legal access to our roads. It's only fair that we fix this problem and ensure a safe, legal way for thousands of Oregonians to continue contributing to our economy and communities.

Driver Card with Limits

Law enforcement worked closely with Oregon's lawmakers to draft Measure 88. It will ensure Oregon drivers will all operate under the same rules. Law enforcement professionals helped write the law to increase the safety of our roads, while avoiding confusion over other privileges associated with a full-fledged driver license, like boarding a plane, registering to vote or obtaining government benefits.

Vote YES on Measure 88

Jules Bailey, Multnomah County Commissioner

Kitty Piercy, Mayor of Eugene

Deborah Kafoury, Multnomah County Chair

Sally Russell, Bend City Councilor

Amanda Fritz, Portland City Commissioner

Steve Milligan, Monmouth City Councilor

Steve Novick, Portland City Commissioner

Linda Modrell, Benton County Commission Chair

Denny Doyle, Mayor of Beaverton

Nick Fish, Portland City Commissioner

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Seniors Support YES on Measure 88,
a Driver Card for Safer Roads

Measure 88 benefits Oregon Seniors by providing alternative paths for a safe and legal Driver Card

We believe that everyone should have the opportunity to get safely and legally to church, work, and school. Measure 88 will provide an alternative, limited Driver Card for Oregonians who need to drive but lack certain paperwork.

Those Oregonians include seniors who were born at home without a birth certificate or whose birth certificates have been lost over the course of their lives. Measure 88 will open a pathway for these seniors to apply for and receive a Driver Card in Oregon.

It means fewer unlicensed and uninsured drivers on the road, which is good for everyone.

Let's provide safe, legal options for all Oregon drivers.

Measure 88 is Good for Oregon Seniors

Please Join

**Oregon State Council for Retired Citizens
and vote YES on Measure 88.**

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon winegrowers are voting YES on Measure 88

Oregon wines are a point of pride across the state, and our 545 wineries and 900 vineyards are known for producing some of the best wines in the world. Our vineyards and wineries are popular tourist destinations for locals and visitors alike. Behind every bottle of Oregon wine is a dedicated, highly-skilled and hard-working group of employees numbering over 13,000 who contribute to our economy and help ensure that our \$2.7 billion industry continues to thrive.

However, some of our employees are ineligible to renew or obtain a traditional driver's license, severely limiting their ability to get to and from work on the hundreds of Oregon family farms producing wine grapes.

When our employees can't drive safely and legally, Oregon's wine grape farmers and winemakers are placed at a serious competitive disadvantage. Unlike other grape growing regions, most Oregon vineyards do not easily lend themselves to mechanization and our farmers rely on skilled, hand labor. In fact, each grapevine in Oregon is touched by a vineyard worker six times in a growing season. This is delicate, labor-intensive work, but part of what makes Oregon wines unique.

Additionally, these employees are our friends and neighbors. They work hard, enrich our communities and pay their taxes. Driver cards are a common-sense fix that will make our roads and communities safer by requiring driver testing and proof of insurance and will allow our employees to get to and from work legally.

Please join Oregon winegrowers in Voting YES on Measure 88

Oregon Winegrowers Association

Central Oregon Wine and Grapegrowers Association

Rogue Valley Winegrowers Association

South Willamette Wineries Association

Southern Oregon Winery Association

Umpqua Valley Winegrowers Association

Willamette Valley Wineries Association

(This information furnished by William Sweat, Oregon Winegrowers Association.)

Argument in Favor

Law Enforcement Support for Measure 88

"From the perspective of the Portland Police Bureau, this law will enhance the safety and well-being of all Oregon drivers."

- **Portland Police Chief Mike Reece**

Willamette Week, October 18, 2013

"Oregon needs SB 833 [Measure 88] because every driver must know the rules of the road and pass a driving test. The law will reduce accidents, make our roads safer and help protect everyone using our roads from preventable injury. Since each licensed driver is required to get auto insurance, the law will protect everyone using our roads from financial loss.

Currently, we don't have these protections. Too many drivers are unlicensed, untested and uninsured. Passing this measure will make all these requirements the law of the land."

- **Hillsboro Chief of Police Ron Louie (retired)**

The News Register, November 15, 2013

"We see it as a public safety issue... Our preference, and my right as a citizen, is to be able to count on having competent drivers on the road. We are not going to reform immigration by increasing the number of drivers who are not competent, who have not proven their ability to drive and their knowledge of the rules of the road. We depend on that as Oregonians and call upon you to support the bill for the sake of public safety."

- **John Haroldson, Benton County District Attorney**

Public Hearing on SB 833, April 11, 2013

Oregon Senate Committee on Business and Transportation

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Yes on 88: Good for Oregon's Economy, Good for Oregon Jobs

Getting Oregonians to and from work is essential to keeping our economy growing. Unfortunately, there are thousands of working Oregonians who, for one reason or another, are ineligible for a traditional driver license.

Measure 88 would create a conditional and limited duration driver card for Oregon residents, allowing them to purchase insurance to legally and safely drive on our roads.

As local employers and employees, we strongly urge a YES vote on Measure 88 so that all eligible Oregonians can safely and legally get to and from work.

These workers are a big part of Oregon's economic backbone, and without them we cannot continue to grow and expand Oregon's economy.

"As labor commissioner, it's my job to ensure that Oregon businesses have access to a strong workforce. That includes ensuring that key sectors—such as our nurseries, wineries, and other agricultural businesses—have workers who can safely and legally drive to their jobs. Oregon's economy and competitiveness are directly linked to the availability of a workforce capable of producing the goods that we all depend on."

**Brad Avakian, Commissioner
Bureau of Labor and Industries**

Oregon Employers, Employees, and Leaders Encourage Oregonians to Join Us in Voting YES on Measure 88

Oregon Association of Nurseries
Oregon AFL-CIO
Oregon Restaurant and Lodging Association
Oregon Dairy Farmers Association
Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Nurses are Voting Yes for Driver Cards

Every day, our exam rooms are visited by Oregonians needing medical assistance, and we are there to help them.

Unfortunately, we can't treat those who can't get to us.

We know there are many Oregonians, including children, who are afraid or unable to visit us for the check-ups, and to receive the care they need to stay healthy and contribute to our society.

We simply cannot have parents hesitating to take their sick children to a health care provider or hospital because they are afraid of driving illegally.

By voting "Yes" for driver cards, we give Oregonians a safe and legal way to:

- **Get to their health care appointments;**
- **Receive routine preventive care, reducing expensive costs further down the road;**
- **Take their sick children to a health care provider or emergency room;**
- **Travel to help an ailing or elderly parent.**

Please join us in keeping our communities safe and healthy by voting "Yes" on Measure 88.

Oregon Nurses Association
Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

The Oregon Catholic Conference Recommends a Vote of YES on 88

Oregon voters are asked to show their support for a bill that already passed the State Legislature with broad bi-partisan support. The law will create a limited purpose and limited duration driver card for qualified residents. Applicants must provide proof of identity, proof of residence in Oregon for more than one year, and pass a written and behind-the-wheel driver test.

The Oregon Driver Card is especially important for immigrant families among us who are our modern day neighbors. The Oregon Driver Card will allow mothers and fathers to drive their children safely and legally to school, to doctor's appointments, to family activities and community events without fear of separation. This law will not solve the complex problems of immigration, but it is a step in the right direction and a gesture of good will toward those who are most in need.

The Oregon Driver Card is good for our neighbors, good for families, and good for Oregon. Let's keep our roads and our residents safe. Be a good neighbor. VOTE YES on 88 - the Oregon Driver Card.

(This information furnished by Todd Cooper, Representative, Oregon Catholic Conference.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon State Newspapers Agree: Yes on Driver Card

"Possibly -- we can hope -- Congress will manage some kind of overall immigration resolution, recognizing the people who are here and the reality that they're not leaving. **But Oregon is right not to wait -- or to count on it -- and do what is in the state's power to try to bring some order to the immigrants' situation.**"

- *Oregonian*, May 2, 2013

"The short-term driver license would require the DMV's usual driving tests. That is important, because driving practices in the U.S. are far different from those in some other cultures. An undocumented-immigrant driver who becomes informed on Oregon traffic regulations is a safer driver.

In addition, there are a good many Oregonians who qualify as citizens or other legal resident but have been unable to obtain driver licenses since the Real ID Act took effect. They have lost their papers, they have been unable to get a birth certificate or, because they were born in a different era, no official records of their birth exist.

SB 833 [which is now Measure 88] is good for Oregon. It doesn't affect immigration status. It addresses safer driving."

- *Statesman Journal*, April 15, 2013

"The primary purpose of a driver's license is to keep the state's roads safe for all Oregonians, not to serve as an immigration document or to deceive authorities. It's not in the interest of Oregonians to have unlicensed and uninsured drivers on the roads, and it's not in the interest of Oregon businesses to have employees who can't drive legally."

- *Register Guard*, April 4, 2013

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 88 is a Law Enforcement Priority for Oregon It Will Reduce Crime and Make Our Communities Safer

1. Make our Roads Safer

Requiring all drivers on the road to pass a driver's test and get auto insurance will reduce accidents, make our roads safer, and protect everyone using our roads from preventable injury and financial losses. Right now we don't have that protection and too many drivers are unlicensed, untested, and uninsured. Measure 88 makes all these requirements the law of the land.

2. Reduce Crime

Making sure everyone on our roads has valid identification will enable police to identify drivers involved in accidents or violating traffic laws, encourage people to come forward to help solve crime and reduce hit and run accidents. That's why this policy is supported by members of the law enforcement community.

3. Driver Card is Limited

The new driver card will only be a permit to legally drive and get auto insurance, which will increase the safety of Oregon roads for everyone on the road. The driver card will not give card holders additional rights or privileges associated with having a regular driver license, like the ability to buy guns or get a concealed carry permit in the state of Oregon, board a plane, vote or get any government benefits for which they are not otherwise eligible.

Please Vote YES on Measure 88

Former Oregon Attorney General Hardy Myers

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's Faith Leaders Urge a YES Vote on Measure 88.

Undocumented Oregonians are a part of our communities and they are a part of our congregations. We go to the grocery store with them, to school with them, to work with them and to church with them.

Simply, undocumented Oregonians are not "they," but "us." They are our neighbors and our friends.

Preventing our neighbors and our friends from the ability to legally drive undermines their basic human dignity and it keeps families apart.

Measure 88 is a compassionate, fair and just approach that will keep our roads safe and give all Oregonians the opportunity to safely get to church, work and school.

The undersigned strongly urge a YES Vote on Measure 88:

David Leslie, Executive Director Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon
 St. Andrew Catholic Church
 Ainsworth United Church of Christ Portland, OR
 Rev. Dr. Sally L. Godard
 Pastor Janine Delaunay, Aloha United Methodist Church
 Pastor Cole Brown, Emmaus Church
 Zion United Church of Christ, Gresham
 Rev. W.J. Mark Knutson III, Augustana Lutheran Church
 St. Charles Borromeo Catholic Church
 Ron Werner, Jr., Director of
 Youth Ministries, Nativity Lutheran Church, Bend, OR
 Peace and Justice Team, First Presbyterian Church, Bend, OR
 Oregon Center for Christian Voices
 St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, Portland
 Reverend Joseph Santos-Lyons
 Fr. David E. Schiferl, Pastor
 Rev. Dr. David L. Wheeler
 Rev. Dr. Walter John Boris, Conference
 Minister, Central Pacific Conference, United Church of Christ
 UUSC First Unitarian Church
 Rabbi Debra Kolodny

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon AFSCME supports Measure 88 and the ability for all Oregonians to be safe when they are driving on the road.

There are thousands of Oregonians who, for an array of reasons, are ineligible for a traditional driver's license. Measure 88 would create a conditional driver's card for Oregon residents to provide an alternative path for licensure and insurance. **It's very important to note these cards can't be used as federal ID or to register to vote.** They exist simply to make driving safer for all and to make sure that those on the road are trained and have access to insurance.

Right now there are drivers on the road without proper training or insurance. We need to create a system that allows people who are going to drive, no matter what, the ability to do so safely. We should not deny any working Oregonian the access they need to support themselves and their families. This is a common sense approach to keeping the roads safer. These people will still need to prove residency and pass both written and behind-the-wheel tests in order to get their cards — which will, in turn, make the roads safer for all drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists.

This measure was the product of a bi-partisan effort to deal with a real problem that was not being addressed anywhere else. This is about equal opportunity for all Oregonians, and we should support this effort.

Allow all eligible Oregonians to safely and legally drive to work. Support this common sense solution to make our roads safer. Vote YES on Measure 88.

(This information furnished by Joe E Baessler.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's Agricultural Employers are Voting Yes on Measure 88

Oregon is an agricultural state, and we're proud that over 98% of Oregon farms, nurseries, and ranches are family owned and operated. With over \$5 billion of value, Oregon agriculture is one of the state's top economic drivers, creating jobs in every corner of the state.

But when our employees can't drive safely and legally to and from work, it hurts our ability to do business here. These Oregonians work hard and pay their taxes. Yet, they are denied safe, legal access to our roads, limiting their ability to get to and from work.

We've waited and waited for congress to take action, but Washington, D.C. has repeatedly failed to address our broken immigration system.

So it's up to us:

Driver cards are a common-sense fix that will make our roads and communities safer, and allow our hard-working employees to get to and from work.

It's only fair that we fix this problem, and ensure a safe, legal way for ALL our workers to continue contributing to our economy, to our communities, and to our family farms.

Join Us in Voting YES on Measure 88

Oregon Association of Nurseries

Columbia Gorge Fruit Growers

Oregon Dairy Farmers Association

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

We're Voting YES on Measure 88

Our broad coalition of businesses, faith leaders, healthcare workers, educators, community organizations and advocates urge you to vote YES on Measure 88.

We can make our roads and communities safer by authorizing Oregon DMV to issue limited purpose driver cards to all qualified Oregon residents, reducing the number of unlicensed and uninsured drivers on the road.

Sincerely,

Oregon Association of Nurseries
 American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon
 Coalition for a Livable Future
 Multnomah County Democratic Party
 Oregon AFL-CIO
 Oregon NOW (National Organization for Women)
 Oregon Latino Health Coalition (OLHC)
 AFSCME Council 75
 Columbia Gorge Fruit Growers
 American Federation of Teachers - Oregon (AFT-Oregon)
 Oregon Education Association
 Oregon School Employees Association, AFT Local 6732
 Ainsworth United Church of Christ, Portland, OR
 Peace and Justice Team, First Presbyterian Church, Bend, OR
 St. Andrew Catholic Church
 St. Charles Borromeo Catholic Church
 Zion United Church of Christ, Gresham
 Basic Rights Oregon

Causa Oregon
 Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
 Urban League of Portland
 Center for Intercultural Organizing
 Adelante Mujeres
 Metropolitan Alliance for Common Good
 Educate Ya, Inc.
 Unidos Bridging Community
 Opal Environmental Justice Oregon
 The Salem/Keizer Coalition for Equality
 Partnership for Safety and Justice
 Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice
 Oregon State Council for Retired Citizens
 Main Street Alliance of Oregon
 Latino Business Alliance
 Oregon Landscape Contractors Association
 Oregon Restaurant and Lodging Association
 SEIU Local 49
 SEIU Local 503
 Pinos y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN)
 Oregon Public Health Association
 Immigrant Family Advocates (IFA), Bend, Oregon
 CAPACES Leadership Institute

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Winegrowers are Voting YES on Measure 88

Measure 88 is a common-sense solution to make our roads and communities safer, while ensuring that all Oregonians have a safe and legal option to drive to work, church, and school.

As winegrowers, we can attest to our state's unique needs across the agriculture community and the impact Measure 88 has on our ability to continue contributing to Oregon's economy while producing our special Oregon products.

U.S. Congress has failed to act on immigration reform, which means it's up to Oregon to identify temporary solutions that work for us. Oregon's agriculture workforce is skilled, and we value their contribution to our businesses and to the Oregon economy. But unless we pass Measure 88, many of our employees will lack a safe, legal option to drive where they need to be. If they can't drive to work, we struggle to make our products.

These Oregonians are more than just our employees. They are our neighbors, friends, and community members. They pay taxes and they work hard, and we believe there must be a path for all Oregonians to be tested, licensed, and insured so we can all safely drive our roads.

Please join us in voting YES on 88. Allow our hard-working employees to get to and from work and ensure our economy grows.

A to Z Wineworks
 David Adelsheim, Adelsheim Vineyard
 Bethel Heights Vineyard
 Bjornson Vineyard
 Bjorn Farm, LLC
 BlackCap of Oregon
 Brick House Vineyards
 Ellen Brittan, co-owner of Brittan Vineyards
 Robert Brittan, co-owner of Brittan Vineyards
 Chehalem Inc.
 Crawford Beck Vineyard, LLC.
 Cristom Vineyards
 Elk Cove Vineyards
 Finnigan Hill Vineyard
 J.K. Carriere LLC
 Loosen Christopher Wines
 Oracle Vineyard
 Alex Sokol Blosser, Sokol Blosser Winery

R. Stuart and Co. Winery
 The Eyrie Vineyards
 Westrey Wine Co.
 Z'IVO Wines

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

**City Club of Portland Recommends a Yes Vote
 Improve Road Safety in Oregon**

What does this measure do?

Ballot Measure 88 would uphold state law and allow the Department of Motor Vehicles to issue a "driver card" to Oregonians who cannot prove legal presence in the United States. A person must meet all other requirements for a Driver License.

Why was it proposed?

While the state does not enforce federal immigration law, it is responsible for determining who may drive in the state in order to promote public safety. Driving privileges should be based on the ability to drive safely, know the rules of the road and obtain auto insurance - and not immigration status.

Driver Cards would help law enforcement officials identify drivers but could not be used for federal identification purposes, such as receiving benefits.

Why vote yes?

Improve road safety by allowing undocumented residents to demonstrate competency behind the wheel by passing driving and knowledge tests. Not offering a driver card guarantees some Oregon residents would be unlicensed and, consequently, unable to procure auto insurance.

Driver cards would not attract undocumented residents because our surrounding states (with the exception of Idaho) already offer driving privileges to undocumented residents. The availability of jobs seems to be the primary magnet for in-migration to any location.

Undocumented residents are a significant part of our communities and our economy. Giving them the opportunity to drive legally to work, shop, go to school, attend religious services, and access health care will strengthen Oregon communities and uphold City Club of Portland's core value of inclusion - which includes welcoming all voices of our community.

City Club Members Vote:

Yes 95%

No 5%

Who is City Club of Portland?

We bring together civic-minded people to make Portland and Oregon better places to live, work and play for everyone. Read our complete recommendation and become a City Club member at:

www.pdxcityclub.org

(This information furnished by Karen Kervin, President, City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Favor

**Organizations Working for Fairness,
 Freedom, and Human Dignity**

Call for a YES Vote on Measure 88

The limited driver card that Measure 88 creates for qualified Oregon residents will make our communities safer for all of us.

Right now, **too many Oregonians are unable to safely and legally drive to work, church and school** because they can't produce the documents they need to get a driver's license.

That includes Oregonians who are undocumented—many of whom are neighbors, co-workers, and friends. They work hard and pay millions in taxes to support critical services like healthcare, education and public safety, yet they are denied safe, legal access to our roads.

It's time to fix this problem, and ensure a safe, legal way for undocumented workers to continue contributing to our economy and communities.

Please join us in voting YES on Measure 88 so all Oregonians can travel our roads more safely.

Signed,
Basic Rights Oregon
Causa Oregon
American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon (APANO)
Oregon Latino Health Coalition (OLHC)
Urban League of Portland
Center for Intercultural Organizing
Adelante Mujeres
Metropolitan Alliance for Common Good
Educate Ya, Inc.
Unidos Bridging Community
Opal Environmental Justice Oregon
The Salem/Keizer Coalition for Equality
Partnership for Safety and Justice
Interfaith Movement for Immigrant Justice
Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN)

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon Governors Strongly Support Measure 88

Oregon Must Step Up Because Congress Has Failed to Act

Congress has failed to act on immigration reform, creating uncertainty for Oregon employers, families and communities.

States are stepping up to make needed changes because the federal government is more concerned about politics than solutions.

Measure 88 is a common sense response to keep Oregon communities safe. Its premise is to reduce the number of uninsured and unlicensed drivers on the road. But Measure 88 was motivated by a much larger belief—that every person in this state, regardless of the color of their skin, regardless of their home language, regardless of their gender, has an equal chance at the American Dream.

A driver card will ensure that thousands of Oregon families, senior citizens and community members can safely get to work, church and school. And Measure 88 will improve the safety of the roads for all of us, because it requires everyone to pass a written and behind-the-wheel test and get auto insurance.

Measure 88 is an economic opportunity issue. It is an equity issue, and it is a human rights issue.

We Urge You to Vote YES on Measure 88.

Governor John Kitzhaber
Governor Ted Kulongoski
Governor Barbara Roberts

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Northwest Health Foundation Supports a YES Vote for Oregon Driver Cards

In order to have healthy people, healthy communities and a healthy economy, everyone needs a safe way to travel. Measure 88 is a common sense approach that provides a legal way for all our residents to drive.

Oregon Driver Cards will help:

- Mothers and fathers commute to their workplaces.
- Kids get to school on time.
- Adults and children receive the medical care they need.
- Our entire community travel without worry.

A YES vote on Measure 88 is a YES vote for the health of our families, communities and future.

Please join us in giving everyone a chance to transport themselves safely and legally.

Vote YES on Measure 88.

Northwest Health Foundation

(This information furnished by caroline fitchett, Yes for Safe Roads.)

Argument in Favor

Teachers & School Employees Support YES on Measure 88

If you want to know what your community will look like in the future, there's only one place you need to look: our schools.

How we educate our students and prepare them for the future has a direct impact on Oregon's future. As do any limits or barriers to these students' access to education.

Right now, our classrooms are full of students who would be impacted positively by a YES vote on Measure 88.

- These include the DREAMers, who are waiting for federal policy to catch up with the times.
- They are the students who were born here in Oregon, but whose mothers and fathers were not.
- And they include the youth of today who don't understand why driving privileges should be at stake for anyone.

A YES on Measure 88 provides an opportunity for these students and their parents to drive to and from school without breaking the law. A YES on Measure 88 means more access to school and learning.

We are teachers and school employees— and we support Measure 88 for education access.

American Federation of Teachers - Oregon (AFT-Oregon)

Oregon Education Association

Oregon School Employees Association, AFT Local 6732

Visit voteyeson88.com for more information.

(This information furnished by Caroline Fitchett, YES Safe Roads.)

Argument in Opposition

It's true this is a **nation founded by immigrants**. My father was among those who immigrated here in pursuit of the **American Dream**.

It's also true the federal government's broken immigration policies continue to create problems that are left to the states to solve.

But neither of those is reason enough to allow people who are in this country illegally to obtain driving privileges.

Oregon is not the first state to pass legislation enabling undocumented persons to apply for and receive driver's cards. **New Mexico and Tennessee** have done so in the past. Officials in New Mexico found that such a policy **failed to reduce the number of uninsured drivers in the state**. Other issues involving **fraud, human trafficking, organized crime and national security** have prompted the governor there to seek repeal of that law. **Tennessee has rescinded its law over similar concerns.**

Last summer, we witnessed the problems that arose when the nation's southern border was besieged by a flood of people hoping to emigrate from Central America. Providing driving privileges to illegal immigrants will only exacerbate that situation.

American citizens have to provide documentation to renew their driver's licenses, even if their personal information has been in DMV databases for decades. **It should not be easier for a non-citizen to obtain driving privileges** than it is for citizens. Longtime citizens have to provide multiple forms of valid identification, as well as proof of mailing address. Under the law we are seeking to repeal **individuals with no proof of legal presence** only have to show proof of Oregon residency and some form of ID – often of suspect validity.

Driving is a privilege, and so is citizenship. Multiple generations of immigrants, including my father, obtained their citizenship and their driver's license through the proper channels. To allow people who are here illegally to have the privilege of driving is insulting to all citizens.

(This information furnished by Sal C Esquivel, Jr.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregonians for Immigration Reform opposes driver cards for illegal immigrants

Measure 88 is terrible policy. Conceived, created, and passed under a disgraceful veil of secrecy and trickery, the bill works against the best interests of all Oregonians. Protect Oregon Driver Licenses (PODL), a nonprofit political action group, organized a statewide referendum campaign to bring this issue out of the shadows and onto the ballot. Tens of thousands of Oregonians committed their signatures to our campaign, united in the belief that we all deserved a chance to vote on this law.

- Granting driver privilege cards to illegal immigrants is a dangerous, expensive scheme.
- **Lowering standards to acquire state-issued identification poses criminal and national security threats that far outweigh any supposed "public safety" benefits.**
- States currently issuing such cards find that traffic safety issues remain unchanged. New Mexico issues driver licenses to illegal immigrants and *still* has one of the highest rates of uninsured driving in the nation.
- Other states – including Oregon – have issued such cards, but stopped due to the detrimental effects. Oregon stopped issuing driver licenses to illegal immigrants in 2008, with strong bipartisan support; today, special interest groups and certain businesses attempt to sneak this bill through hoping that Oregonians won't notice.
- Driver privilege cards would **cause a surge in illegal immigration to Oregon**, increasing the load on overburdened public programs. Already, services to illegal immigrants costs Oregonians over one billion dollars per year.
- Cartel operations, human trafficking and the flow of narcotics through Oregon would be made easier and

will likely increase criminal behavior. **If this law passes, citizens will be less safe.**

- For a full list of law enforcement and other endorsements visit www.ProtectOregonDL.org

This law, sneaked through the Legislature in direct opposition to the wishes of the people, is a bad idea on every front. It **benefits only special interest groups and certain businesses at the expense of the safety and financial well-being of the entire state.**

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, President - Oregonians for Immigration Reform.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON 88

DRIVER CARDS WOULD ATTRACT ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS TO OREGON

Policies enacted by America's governments can attract illegal immigrants to our nation. President Obama's "DREAM" amnesty, for example, helped spark the recent surge of tens of thousands of Central American minors to our southern border.

As well, state policies can encourage illegal immigration. One such policy is *driving privileges for illegal immigrants*.

How powerfully are illegal immigrants attracted to states that offer driving privileges? Consider what Eddie de la Cruz of Hermiston's Hispanic Advisory Committee told the *East Oregonian* recently: that illegal immigrants are leaving our state for (in the newspaper's words) "states where they are allowed to drive to work legally." If Oregon voters approve illegal-immigrant driving privileges, they will make ours one of the few states that offers those privileges -- and *create a powerful magnet that will draw even more illegal immigrants here.* **VOTE NO ON 88.**

VOTE NO ON 88

DRIVER CARDS WOULD BETTER ENABLE ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS TO TAKE JOBS FROM OREGONIANS

Overwhelmingly, illegal immigrants take low-skilled, lower-wage jobs in fields like food services, construction, building maintenance and groundskeeping. These aren't "jobs Americans won't do," but *are* jobs Americans need.

For many Oregonians, these kinds of jobs provide their families' main support; for others, crucial supplemental income. For youths new to the job market, they provide experience in adult responsibility. And for many of our long-term unemployed, such jobs are the likeliest to offer a foot back into the working world.

Today in Oregon, according to the state Employment Department, more than 200,000 U.S. citizens and legal residents either are jobless or "involuntary part-time workers." Concurrently, the Federation for American Immigration Reform has estimated, *more than 120,000 illegal immigrants may hold Oregon jobs -- jobs that driver cards would better enable them to seek and retain.* **VOTE NO ON 88.**

(This information furnished by Richard F. LaMountain, chief petitioner of referendum campaign to repeal illegal-immigrant driver cards.)

Argument in Opposition

VOTE NO ON 88

SHERIFFS OF OREGON

OPPOSE DRIVING PRIVILEGES

FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

The Sheriffs of Oregon Political Action Committee urge Oregonians to vote “no” on special driving privilege cards designed specifically for those who are here illegally.

The purpose of the special driving privilege card is to help Federal immigration lawbreakers evade the penalties for crossing the border illegally. Allowing lower identification standards for illegal residents while requiring much stricter rules for legal residents undermines the rule of law. A special privilege driver’s license will also attract a large number of out-of-state illegal aliens to our communities to apply for an Oregon card. We will become a magnet state. These cards will give illegal residents greater mobility and make it easier for them to travel in the rest of the country. To avoid such a “slippery slope,” Oregonians should support enforcing all Federal, state and local residency and identification laws by voting NO on 88.

According to Les Zaitz of *The Oregonian*, Mexican drug cartels and the American-based gangs they associate with “control nearly every ounce of heroin, methamphetamine and cocaine flowing into the region.” In 2013, the Oregon Medical Examiner reported that those very drugs killed 222 of our state’s residents. Issuing driving privilege cards without requiring proof of legal residence and without providing verifiable identification can only add to the current illegal immigration problem. It is an incentive Oregon can’t afford to offer.

For those of us who enforce the law, it makes no sense to offer driving privileges to people who deliberately break the law.

The Sheriffs of Oregon PAC

urge you to vote NO

on special driving privileges

for illegal aliens.

Vote NO on 88

(This information furnished by Tom J Bergin, Sheriffs of Oregon PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon has a long history of fraud associated with illegal aliens, driver licenses and voter registration.

Oregonians oppose Driver Cards because:

- Other states that have passed similar regulations are reversing these decisions because of fraud and abuse.
- Driver cards only require a Matrícula Consular card. DOJ and FBI say this is not a reliable form of documentation, because no US authority can substantiate its authenticity. This allows fraudulent ID to exist for obtaining multiple bank accounts and allows money laundering and movement within the country, without alarming a national watch list.
- This bill does not define what other documents DMV may decide to also administratively accept.
- The bill was crafted to say what it could be used for, but did not restrict its use. Driver cards meet the I-9 document requirement, used for verifying the identity and employment authorization of individuals hired for employment in the United States.
- A driver card holder will be able to get endorsements to run commercial vehicles within 100 miles of their employers’ farm that otherwise would be federally restricted to CDL ID and licensing.
- Prior to 2007, Oregon contributed greatly to ID fraud. Finally Gov. Kulongoski issued an executive order that required a birth certificate for ODL.
- Regardless of citizenship status, our law REQUIRES that all applicants for licenses and social services be asked if they would like to register to vote.

- Lawmakers stated in the Legislative hearings that driver cards are not to be used to register to vote; yet administrative databases do not restrict using it.
- Aiding foreign nationals to break the law, so they can live and operate easily, is against the law. It is a treasonous act against your fellow Americans and it will change our voter rolls and elections.
- Our immigration process allows an orderly immigration process. Let’s insist that it be honored. Many of our finest citizens have gone through that process!

Vote NO on Driver cards for illegal aliens!

<http://www.electionoregon.com>

(This information furnished by Janice R Dysinger.)

Argument in Opposition

Michael W. Cutler, Senior Special Agent INS (retired) urges a NO vote on driver cards for illegal aliens

Driver’s licenses, cards and similar documents, provide more than evidence of the authority to drive a vehicle, they serve as the **defacto national identity document** for the United States and are essential to conducting most routine transactions.

They are essential to enter corporate and government buildings, open bank accounts, cash checks, make significant purchases and check into hotels. In providing documentary evidence of the bearer’s identity, a driver’s card **provides its bearer with the appearance of credibility and trustworthiness.**

For aliens engaged in terrorism or criminal activities, it can **provide a cloak to conceal his true identity** and movements around the country, thereby undermining public safety and national security.

America’s borders and immigration laws are its first and last line of defense against international terrorists and transnational criminals and are supposed to protect the lives and livelihoods of American and lawful immigrant workers.

No sane person would board an airliner if fellow passengers were observed evading the TSA security inspection at the airport that is supposed to keep terrorists and weapons off of airplanes.

Aliens who run our borders evade the similar vital inspections process at ports of entry that is supposed to prevent alien terrorists and criminals from entering the U.S. Such aliens are often referred to as “undocumented,” meaning they don’t have or perhaps, **don’t want to show their official identity documents** - perhaps because they are criminals or terrorists. In point of fact, these aliens are un-inspected.

The “9/11 Commission Staff Report on Terrorist Travel” noted that the 19 terrorists who attacked the U.S on 9/11 used a total of 364 aliases and name variations. They used driver’s licenses and other such documents to establish these various false identities.

False aliases shielded them from the scrutiny of law enforcement and **enabled them to hide in plain sight**, as they went about their deadly preparations.

(This information furnished by Cynthia J Kendoll, Authorized Agent - Protect Oregon Driver Licenses.)

Argument in Opposition

Facts related to issuing a valid driver’s card and to those that can’t prove they are legally present in the U.S.

For employment purposes one of the documents accepted as proof of identity in order to complete the I-9 is a valid driver’s card. “Driver’s licenses and ID cards account for nearly **80 percent** of the documents used as proof of identity by employees...” [i]

A valid driver's card enables law enforcement personnel to verify the identity of the person whom contact is made with; the presumption is that this is a valid document and as such is that person's true identity. Once a valid driver's card is presented, there is no requirement to further detain or to hold the person in question regarding their citizenship and subsequently they are **FREE** to go. What voters may not realize is that there are no safeguards in place to ensure that the documents presented in order to obtain the driver's card in the first place may not be valid; For example, a criminal alien could present a **fake Mexican Matricula Consular card** to Oregon DMV and obtain a valid Oregon Driver's card.

For the immigration border crisis this will create a "**de facto**" amnesty program here in Oregon. As you know, in certain parts of the country, the southern border is being overrun as many illegal immigrants have already been relocated and are requesting to be sent to Oregon. The word is getting out that Oregon is accepting illegals. [ii] Can you imagine if there are no regulations on the flood of people coming to Oregon?

For citizens of Oregon, is knowing your state will become a magnet and safe haven for criminal and possible terrorist activities by people wishing to mask their identity acceptable? Additionally, schools and hospitals will become overwhelmed in a short time. [iii]

You have the right to choose and that time is now! Vote NO on Ballot Measure 88!

[i] <http://www.uscis.gov/e-verify/employers/drivers-license-verification>

[ii] <http://www.ktvb.com/story/news/politics/2014/07/24/otter-immigration-children/13096601/>

[iii] <http://www.cairco.org/issues/economic-costs-immigration>

(This information furnished by Derek Hernandez, Western Regional Vice President, National Border Patrol Council, AFGE/AFL-CIO.)

Argument in Opposition

It Doesn't Fix the Problem

As a state legislator, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution and our state laws. Measure 88 strengthens neither.

In the Senate I opposed SB 833 because it fails to solve the real problem we have: The current immigration system administered by the federal government is broken. No matter how hard we may want to, we simply cannot fix this problem with Oregon law. What we need is security now.

Around a dozen states have some form of driver card programs for illegals. By further increasing the benefits provided to those who violate the law, you only encourage more illegal immigration. It's clear from the border being overrun with kids and teens that poor policy encourages poor behavior. Let's not have Oregon be a magnet for illegal immigration activity and the high costs associated with it. Illegal immigration has cost taxpayers billions of dollars. It's only through securing our borders that we will begin to solve the problem.

It Doesn't Make Us Safer

When Oregon was faced with responding to the passage of the federal Real ID Act the Legislature in 2008 passed Senate Bill 1080. SB 1080 required proof of legal U.S. residency to receive an Oregon driver's license. It was the right policy response and it makes Oregonians safer.

New Mexico has one of the highest uninsured driver rates in the country and they have been issuing licenses to illegal aliens over a decade. It's gotten so bad that New Mexico's hispanic governor has strongly advocated repealing the law.

The changes Measure 88 makes are inconsistent with federal law. They serve to further confuse law abiding citizens and create perverse incentives for those who do not follow the law. Driver cards for illegal's will not make Oregon citizens safer. They deserve to know the truth. It has no additional mechanism to ensure driver card recipients will carry insurance. Please vote no. Oregonians deserve better.

(This information furnished by Tim Knopp, Senator.)

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

89

Amends Constitution: State/political subdivision shall not deny or abridge equality of rights on account of sex

Estimate of Financial Impact	60
Text of Measure	61
Explanatory Statement	61
Arguments in Favor	62
Arguments in Opposition	none

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote amends state constitution, prohibits state and any political subdivision from denying or abridging equality of rights under the law on account of sex.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote retains current prohibition on laws granting/denying privileges or immunities on account of sex, unless justified by specific biological differences between men/women.

Summary

Under Article I, section 20, of the Oregon Constitution, laws granting privileges or immunities must apply equally to all persons. The Oregon Supreme Court has held that that provision prohibits laws treating people differently based on sex unless justified by specific biological differences. No current provision in constitution expressly states that prohibition. Measure amends Article I by creating new section 46, which provides that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the state or any political subdivision on account of sex. Measure authorizes legislature to enforce that provision by appropriate legislation. Measure provides that nothing in section 46 “shall diminish a right otherwise available to persons under section 20 of this Article or any other provision of this Constitution.”

Estimate of Financial Impact

There is no financial effect on either state or local government expenditures or revenues.

Text of Measure

The Constitution of the State of Oregon is amended by creating a new section 46 to be added to and made a part of Article I, such section to read:

SECTION 46. (1) Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the State of Oregon or by any political subdivision in this state on account of sex.

(2) The Legislative Assembly shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this section.

(3) Nothing in this section shall diminish a right otherwise available to persons under section 20 of this Article or any other provision of this Constitution.

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 89 amends the Oregon Constitution to prohibit state and political subdivisions from denying or abridging equality of rights on account of sex.

There is no provision in the Oregon Constitution that expressly prohibits discrimination based on sex. Ballot Measure 89 adds language as a new provision to the Oregon Constitution expressly prohibiting the denial or abridgment of equality of rights on account of sex.

Article I, section 20 of the Oregon Constitution currently provides that: "No law shall be passed granting to any citizen or class of citizens privileges, or immunities, which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens."

The Oregon Supreme Court has interpreted Article I, section 20 to hold that laws may not treat people differently based on sex unless justified by specific biological differences between men and women.

Ballot Measure 89 provides that nothing in Ballot Measure 89 shall diminish any right otherwise available to persons under the Article I, section 20 or any other provision of the Oregon Constitution.

Ballot Measure 89 grants to the Legislative Assembly the power to enforce the provisions of the measure by enactment of appropriate legislation.

Committee Members:
 Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo
 Nancy Mead
 Fred Neal
 Becky Straus
 Edwin Peterson

Appointed by:
 Chief Petitioners
 Chief Petitioners
 Secretary of State
 Secretary of State
 Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Argument in Favor

Argument in Favor

OREGON'S ELECTED LEADERS ENDORSE BALLOT MEASURE 89

Oregon's leaders support measure 89 - an ERA for women's constitutional equality

Governor John Kitzhaber

U.S. Senator Ron Wyden

U.S. Senator Jeff Merkley

Congressman Earl Blumenauer

Congresswoman Suzanne Bonamici

Congressman Peter DeFazio

Congressman Kurt Schrader

Congresswoman Darlene Hooley

Dave Frohnmayer, Former Oregon Attorney General

Oregon Labor Commissioner Brad Avakian

The Honorable Norma Paulus

Oregon State Senate President Peter Courtney

Diane Rosenbaum, Oregon Senate Majority Leader

Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson, Gresham

State Senator Alan C. Bates, Medford

Senator Lee Beyer, District 6

State Senator Ginny Burdick

Senator Richard Devlin

Senator Betsy Johnson, Scappoose

Senator Floyd Prozanski, Dist. 4

Retired State Senator Margaret Carter

Speaker of the House Tina Kotek

Representative Val Hoyle, Oregon House Majority Leader

Representative Brent Barton, Clackamas County

Rep. Peter Buckley (D-Ashland)

State Representative Brian Clem, HD-21

State Representative Lew Frederick

Representative David Gomberg

State Representative Mitch Greenlick

Representative Caddy McKeown, Coos Bay

State Representative Tobias Read, Beaverton

(to see full list of updated endorsements visit
www.VoteERA.org)

(This information furnished by Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo, VoteERA.org on behalf of Women's Constitutional Equality PAC.)

Argument in Favor

Please support the Equal Rights Amendment and vote YES on Measure 89

My family and I came to the United States from the Democratic Republic of Congo. As a child growing up in Africa, I was painfully aware of the need to recognize women's importance in society and their human and political rights.

Today, I am a 30 year-old financial professional managing credit risk of commodity trading portfolios for a wonderful employer that values and profits from diversity in its workforce.

Women have great opportunities today and many rights in our state. But I can tell you first hand that we should never take

our rights for granted. Women in less developed countries face a gap in education attainment compared to men. I know of girls pulled from school in order to support their family by having to work menial jobs or be married at a young age.

The plight of women in other countries who struggle to attain equality is enough evidence to demand that our equality be guaranteed, not dependent upon the good graces of others.

I support measure 89 because women should be recognized in the Oregon Constitution and women should have equality of rights and equal opportunities in the workplace.

Without equality written in our constitution, women are vulnerable. There are no unintended consequences to equality.

This November we have a chance to give women guaranteed protection against discrimination. A vote for Measure 89 will make sure our young girls all over Oregon can honestly pursue their dreams and that young girls around the world have an example of what should be for all women.

Please vote yes 89 – let's do this together. Never take our rights and equality for granted.

Krystal Gema

Financial Analyst

(This information furnished by Krystal Gema, Financial Analyst.)

Argument in Favor

Please join me in voting yes on Ballot Measure 89

ALL WOMEN DESERVE THE LASTING PROTECTION OF THE OREGON CONSTITUTION

As the third generation leader of Powell's Bookstore in Portland, books and Oregon are in my blood. I grew up immersed in the remarkable history of our state - my father began his career as a commercial fisherman in the Columbia Gorge, and my grandfather, despite being a transplant from New York, found his roots and his way in Portland. Books were a true love of mine from the very beginning. I was never happier than when I was tucked into a quiet corner, sitting on the store's concrete floor, reading.

Although Powell's was founded by my father and grandfather, I was fortunate to grow up surrounded by powerful women leaders of every stripe. The course of my career has been shaped by the incredible businesswomen I have worked with and been mentored by. I am aware, however, that my experience is rare, even in 2014. As soon as I step out of my day-to-day experience, I encounter a different reality where the rights of women are challenged continuously.

I am particularly concerned about women's leadership in Oregon. The path to leadership is a path still denied to many because of an inequality in pay and an inequality in opportunity.

I see women forced to fight battles that waste their time and energy, and deny our communities of their gifts. We need those gifts in order to thrive as a society; without them, we all suffer.

Every day, women are accomplishing great things, and I believe we all have reason to feel optimistic about the future. **When I cast my yes vote on measure 89,** I'll be doing so for the many women who have led us to this better place, and for the women of the next generation who will make our world better still.

Emily Powell
Owner and President, Powell's Bookstore

(This information furnished by Emily Powell, Owner and President, Powell's Bookstore.)

Argument in Favor

VOTE YES on 89

My family homesteaded along the banks of the Willamette River back in 1853 before Oregon was a state and before women had the right to vote or serve on juries. At that time the women in my family were limited in their ability to make basic choices about their lives such as whether or not to attend school, choose a job, or even what clothes to wear.

I cannot imagine what life was like for women in my family, and yours, to live with such inequity. Although women's rights have evolved and are remarkably different today, we still have room for improvement.

Today, women still make less than men, on average, and for too many, there is still a strong gender gap preventing upward mobility.

Many decisions in life are complex; this one is not. We are all equal, with equal rights, regardless of sex. As a father of two girls and an employer of over 5,000 hard working women in our company, I am proud to support placing the Equal Rights Amendment in the Oregon Constitution.

IT'S ABOUT TIME

It has been over 90 years since the original ERA was first drafted. Join my wife Erika and me in voting YES for ballot measure 89. Say yes to the fact that all people in Oregon are equal. As a 7th generation Oregonian, I believe the ERA accurately reflects both our values and our deep respect for women in this great state. Let's be the 23rd state to stand up and recognize, once and for all, that men and women are equal in every way. Following what should be an overwhelming victory for women in Oregon, it is time for the ERA to be memorialized in the US Constitution as well.

Let's finally get it right for all women in Oregon.

VOTE YES on 89

Rick and Erika Miller
Founder and Chairman, The Avamere Group
Co-Founder, Rogue Venture
Partners

(This information furnished by Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo, VoteERA.org, Women's Constitutional Equality PAC.)

Argument in Favor

Boys and Girls Club Director is Voting YES on Ballot Measure 89

I am Denise Gould, Chief Professional Officer of the Boys and Girls Club of Southwestern Oregon for 13 years. Our mission is to assist "all youth to achieve their fullest potential by enhancing their self-esteem, providing positive role models, and by helping them to develop the qualities needed to become caring, productive, responsible citizens."

Ballot Measure 89 is perfectly aligned with the Boys and Girls Club mission, and I am voting YES.

In my work, I have observed that young women face challenges, especially when they hit middle school age. Many girls begin to lose confidence, speak less in class, and shy away from leadership roles. This is especially true for many young women I work with at the Boys and Girls Club who are from lower income households, often being raised by a single parent, usually a mother, who is struggling to both work and care for her children. These young women have few opportunities and mentors.

How can we expect young women to achieve their fullest potential if they do not have equal rights in our constitution?

We try to encourage girls through activities and programs like "Smart Girls," but it is difficult when there continue to

be hurdles for young women today, such as pay inequity, discrimination and harassment, and domestic violence— all eroding young women's confidences and making achievement more difficult.

Ballot Measure 89 will place the Equal Rights Amendment in the Oregon Constitution and will remove one significant hurdle for young women in Oregon. An Oregon Equal Rights Amendment places boys and girls on an equal plain in our state. The young women of our state need this so that they can do whatever they want to do and become whatever they want to become.

Join me in voting YES on Ballot Measure 89!

Denise Gould, Chief Professional Officer of the Boys and Girls Club of Southwestern Oregon

(This information furnished by Denise Gould, Boys and Girls Club of Southwestern Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

America was founded on the guarantee of equal rights under the law.

But, too often, our nation has failed to live up to that promise.

This fall, we can do something about that in Oregon. We can support the Oregon equal rights amendment.

We're voting YES for the equal rights measure to assure basic rights cannot be denied or restricted to any Oregonian simply because she is a woman.

If we Oregon voters pass this measure, every woman will be guaranteed the right to control her own life, to liberty in her choices including healthcare, and to pursue the happiness she chooses for herself.

We recognize that Oregon already protects rights equally in many important aspects. But our state constitution could do more.

Oregon law now allows for unequal rights based on biological differences between women and men. We believe biological differences should not be a basis for discrimination. Passage of Measure 89 will affirm Oregonians' repeated support for women's right to the full range of reproductive options.

When every Oregon woman is secure in her right to decide whether and when to become a mother -- with help from people she trusts that may include her family, doctor or her faith -- we will truly protect rights equally.

Please join us in voting yes on Measure 89 to protect every woman's right to choose.

Michele Stranger Hunter, Executive Director NARAL
Pro-Choice Oregon
Laura Terrill Patten, Executive Director, Planned Parenthood
Advocates of Oregon

(This information furnished by Laura Terrill Patten, Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

City Club of Portland Recommends a Yes Vote Equality Belongs in Our Constitution

What does this measure do?

Under current Oregon law, legal protections against sex-based discrimination are as strong as the state law protections against discrimination based on other suspect classifications, such as race, skin color, and religion. This measure adds to the Oregon Constitution a separate, explicit, state-level protection against sex-based discrimination.

Why has this been proposed?

In 1972, a proposed federal Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was approved by Congress that would have provided for sex-based equality in the U.S. Constitution, but required ratification by three-fourths of the states. After opponents became increasingly effective, the amendment failed.

Over the past three years the movement to restrict reproductive education and healthcare has grown more active. City Club documents a nearly 300 percent increase between 2011 and 2012 in challenges to reproductive rights across the United States. The 2014 U.S. Supreme Court case *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.* allows private companies to use religious exemptions against providing certain reproductive options. This shows the extent to which women continue to be subject to discrimination based on sex.

Why vote Yes?

- Preserves equality between men and women for future generations
- Would not diminish any rights under the Oregon State Constitution
- A No vote could be interpreted as a lack of support of equality for women
- Help defend against possible challenges to equal access to healthcare and reproductive rights for women
- Inspire support for the idea of a federal constitutional amendment to strengthen women's rights nationwide

City Club Members Vote:

Yes 67%

No 33%

Who is City Club of Portland?

We bring together civic-minded people to make Portland and Oregon better places to live, work and play for everyone. Read our complete recommendation and become a City Club member at:

www.pdxcityclub.org

(This information furnished by Karen Kervin, President, City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Favor

Fellow voters,

I was born in Louisiana, one of nine children. My father was a minister and my mother was a cafeteria worker. I worked my way through college and ultimately received a master's degree.

I know first hand about the hard work it takes to fight for equality.

For years, as a citizen, state representative and a state senator, I lobbied, marched, rallied, petitioned, picketed, and exerted as much influence as I could muster to help minimize the inequities, which the government placed between men and women.

Like many women of color of my generation, I had to fight to be treated as an equal.

Despite challenges and inequalities I faced, I worked my way into a position of leadership in my community. After several years working as a counselor, I was recruited to run for the Oregon House of Representatives. I was the first African American woman elected to the Oregon Legislature.

We should not mistake the great strides women have made for full equality under the law.

In parts of our country, women's rights are rolling backward. Here in Oregon, women's equality is based solely on

decisions of the courts. As a veteran of women's battles for equality, I believe we need language in the Constitution that guarantees our equal rights. Measure 89 will once and for all, have the Constitution say exactly what most think it should mean. Legislatures and courts can change over time. But once Measure 89 is in the Constitution, no court or legislature will be able to deprive us of our fundamental equal rights.

An older generation fought many battles to bring women where they are today. Young people, we hope will honor the struggles of those who have made a better place for them. Measure 89 does that and will do more than anything else to preserve and further our hard fought gains.

Please Vote for Measure 89.

Margaret L. Carter
Retired State Senator

(This information furnished by Margaret L. Carter, Retired State Senator.)

Argument in Favor

I am voting yes on ballot measure 89.

I am supporting measure 89 in our Oregon Constitution because I do not believe that the state or government should discriminate against women based on sex. The Oregon Constitution did not take women into account when it was written.

When I entered the restaurant industry in the mid 1960's, opportunities for women were very limited. Virtually all fine dining establishments at that time were exclusive to male staff.

Jake's Famous Crawfish in Portland was our first venture in the development stages of McCormick & Schmick's Restaurant chain. Our team aggressively recruited and trained an all female staff which assured that women were now in equal paying positions working as managers, chefs, servers and hourly employees.

Though there have been extraordinary strides in the hospital industry, the laws of our state relative to equal rights for women are archaic. We recognized the extraordinary talents of women and how their skills were underutilized.

Certainly half the population of the state should have their equality expressed in the Constitution! I have daughters and grand daughters I want them to have the Constitutional protection they are entitled. Measure 89 will make that happen. It's about time.

Please join me in voting YES for Measure 89.

William P. McCormick
U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand 2005-2008
Chair Emeritus McCormick & Schmick's

(This information furnished by William P McCormick, Ambassador.)

Argument in Favor

I was born and raised on a wheat ranch in Pendleton Oregon.

I am a strong supporter for ballot measure 89 and I hope you will join me in voting yes.

My brother and I are the 5th generation on our Eastern Oregon family ranch and grew up working side by side. I was the first female wheat truck driver for our ranch and drove our 18-wheeler truck hauling wheat to the Port of Umatilla elevators.

I participated in sports just as women's athletics were gaining popularity in high school. My basketball teammates and I were the first four-year girls basketball letter winners. I also grew up riding horses, competing in rodeos and was honored to serve as the Queen of the Pendleton Round Up in 1982.

The opportunities I had were because of my family and the fact that they treated me as an equal. They believed I could do anything a boy of my age could do and I have treated my own two daughters the same way.

Equal rights for women belong in our Oregon constitution. When we consider other rights we do have in the constitution, it is clear that women will gain a higher level of protection against sex discrimination than we have now.

The ERA is not a symbolic gesture, it is providing women constitutional protection and full equality in the Oregon Constitution that they have never had.

Voting yes on ballot measure 89 means women in Oregon will finally have their state constitution recognize them. Providing equality expressly in our constitution means women will not be vulnerable to losing rights they have achieved and the ERA will provide a future path to help women eliminate inequalities that still exist.

Please join me in supporting Ballot Measure 89.

Katy Thorne Coba, Salem (formerly Pendleton)

(This information furnished by Katy Thorne Coba, Salem (formerly Pendleton).)

Argument in Favor

We need Ballot Measure 89 to pass!

Women are still not equal in our U.S. Constitution

Women do not have equality expressly in the Oregon Constitution

As a former Member of Congress from the 5th District, I am astounded that women are still not equal under the U.S. Constitution. Some may think the Equal Rights Amendment was placed in our U.S. Constitution in the 1970s, however, it fell three states short of ratification. While laws have been passed with the intention of providing women protection, women's rights have been rolling backward for decades.

It is necessary to place the Equal Rights Amendment in the Oregon Constitution

The rights we want most protected are in our constitutions. Our communities will benefit when all members of our families have equality. I remember when, not too long ago, women could not attend particular classes because they were for boys only. Girls had minimal access to sports. While some inequalities have resolved, women have never been afforded express protection in our constitution. Under earlier interpretations of our constitution, women could not serve on juries, or work the same jobs, or same hours, as men.

We still have more work to do.

Supporting Measure 89 is part of my life long mission to make a difference in my community. I became involved in politics in 1976 because I wanted to make safer playgrounds for children. From there, I became the first woman to sit on the West Linn City Council. Let's do something for women this time.

Please join me in voting YES on Ballot Measure 89.

Congresswoman Darlene Hooley

(This information furnished by Congresswoman Darlene Hooley.)

Argument in Favor

THERE IS BI-PARTISAN SUPPORT FOR PLACING THE ERA IN THE OREGON CONSTITUTION

Dear Legislators, THANK YOU for being early supporters of the ERA.

Ballot Measure 89 uses the same language from two bills introduced in the 2013 legislature, SJR 24 and HJR 21. Measure 89 also includes amendments that were proposed for those bills during the 2013 legislature. <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2013R1/Measures/list/> Here is the key language:

SECTION 46. (1) "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the State of Oregon or by any political subdivision in this state on account of sex."

(2) "The Legislative Assembly shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this section."

(3) "Nothing in this section shall diminish a right otherwise available to persons under section 20 of this Article or any other provision of this Constitution." (Note: Subparagraph (3) was proposed as an amendment to these bills.)

The legislative website shows the following state senators and state representatives who sponsored or co-sponsored one or more of these bills:

SENATE DEMOCRATS: Arnie Roblan, Elizabeth Steiner Hayward, Alan Bates, Lee Beyer, Ginny Burdick, Richard Devlin, Jackie Dingfelder, Mark Hass, Betsy Johnson, Floyd Prozanski, and Diane Rosenbaum.

SENATE REPUBLICANS: Brian Boquist, Herman Baertschiger, Ted Ferrioli, Tim Knopp, Bruce Starr, Chuck Thomsen, and Jackie Winters

HOUSE DEMOCRATS: Jeff Barker, Phil Barnhart, Brent Barton, Debbie Boone, Peter Buckley, Brian Clem, Michael Dembrow, Margaret Doherty, Chris Garrett, David Gomberg, Mitch Greenlick, Val Hoyle, Alissa Keny-Guyer, Caddy McKeown, Jeff Reardon, and Tobias Read

HOUSE REPUBLICANS: Cliff Benz, Jason Conger, John Davis, Sal Esquivel, Wally Hicks, Mark Johnson, Bill Kennemer, Wayne Krieger, Mike McLane, Julie Parrish, and Vicki Berger

Vote YES on 89

Women gained the right to vote in Oregon in 1912 by turning to the initiative. We also turn to the initiative to add an ERA to the Oregon Constitution and look forward to the day the Federal Constitution contains an ERA.

Onward and Forward—

VoteERA.org team

(This information furnished by Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo, VoteERA.org, Women's Constitutional Equality PAC.)

Argument in Favor

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 89

As a teacher, and later Dean and Principal at Marshfield High School in Coos Bay, I worked with young people for 32 years, helping them to realize positive outcomes as they moved on to college or into the workforce. I was often troubled that young women I worked with thought their opportunities after graduation were limited.

THERE IS STILL MORE TO DO

Women's opportunities are still limited by a pay disparity in the workplace. Young women on college campuses still find themselves fighting for the respect necessary to take full advantage of their academic opportunities.

MEASURE 89 WILL WRITE EQUALITY INTO THE CONSTITUTION

Measure 89 will, for the first time, specifically guarantee women express equality in our constitution. Legal authorities including the Oregon Attorney General, the State of Oregon's Legislative Counsel and four recently retired Oregon

Supreme Court Justices have provided opinions that explain why we need an Equal Rights Amendment in our Oregon Constitution. Measure 89 advances the cause of women and does not diminish any other rights.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT HAS BROAD BI-PARTISAN SUPPORT

It is no wonder that Measure 89 is endorsed by so many public officials and leading citizens from all corners of our state. During the 2013 regular legislative session, virtually identical proposals won the bi-partisan sponsorship of 51 members of the legislature. An Equal Rights Amendment in the Oregon Constitution is truly an idea whose time has come.

ESTABLISHES POLICY

Measure 89 will establish a “no unequal treatment” policy in our state Constitution.

VOTE YES ON 89

As a State Senator and former Co-Speaker of The House of Representatives, I strongly support Measure 89 and urge you to join me in voting yes on Measure 89.

State Senator Arnie Roblan

(This information furnished by State Senator Arnie Roblan.)

Argument in Favor

AFSCME supports expressly putting equality for women into the Oregon Constitution. Our union has a fundamental belief in equality and believe that putting this language in our state constitution is important to ensuring equality for women in our state. As a union that represents working people all over the state, we are in a constant struggle to improve the working standards for all people. Even in 2014, women are frequently paid less for the same work than men and they are often the victims of harassment and hostile working situations. This measure will not fix all the problems in the workplace, but it is a move in the right direction.

It’s important that we send a message that women are supported in our state — this measure will make that clear. Over 60 percent of AFSCME’s membership is made up of women and we want to make sure that they are protected from attacks on their equality. There’s little reason to oppose this measure and we believe it is in everyone’s best interest to support it.

Please vote YES on Measure 89 and support women’s rights.

(This information furnished by Joe E Baessler.)

Argument in Favor

Lane County Residents urge a YES vote on Ballot Measure 89

We are a diverse group of Lane County business owners, educators, attorneys, and other professionals coming together for this simple message:

[We are voting Yes on Ballot Measure 89 to place an Equal Rights Amendment in the Oregon Constitution.](#)

We have the largest university in the state and other great education institutions. The majority of students who attend those institutions are local Oregonians and half of those attending are women.

Half those students will have a more difficult time becoming CEOs of companies. Half of those students will earn less for the same job than the other half. Half those students are more likely to be heads of households while raising families as a single parent.

“Women in state government make about 88 percent of what men do,” *Statesman Journal*, August 11, 2014, <http://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/news/politics/2014/08/10/women-paid-percent-men-state-government/13837901/>

We encourage young women to be whatever they want to be, but the truth is, statistically that is more difficult for them.

With your yes vote today, Oregon women will finally have full equality in the Oregon constitution.

[Women and girls should have their equality written into the constitution.](#)

Without a state ERA, women are left grasping for equality here and there – fighting for equal pay, fighting for protection against domestic violence, fighting for inclusion.

[Let’s stop that piecemeal approach to equality, let’s include over half our population in our state constitution.](#)

Please join us in voting YES on Ballot Measure 89.

Nikos Ridge, CEO, Ninkasi Brewing Company
Erin Gould, Attorney, VoteERA.org board member
Lee Davidson MD, Emergency Physician and Partner in Eugene Urgent Care
Kamala Shugar, Attorney
Margaret Hallock, Economist and Policy Advocate
Ofer Raban, Constitutional Law Professor
Marshall L. Wilde, Attorney
Evangelina Sundgrenz, Lane County
Gilad Gozlan, Life Cycle Bike Shop Owner
Susan Cundiff, Educator
Charlie Swanson, Teacher

(This information furnished by Erin Gould, Attorney, VoteERA.org board member.)

Argument in Favor

I urge you to vote YES on Ballot Measure 89.

I’m supporting and Oregon ERA and measure 89 because:

- We still do not have equal pay for equal work and I believe that wages should not be determined by gender but the quality of your work.
- Protections for women’s rights are subject to the winds of political change as we have seen in other states where legislation is being passed to roll back our rights. Oregonians have an opportunity to ensure equality for women is enshrined in our constitution.
- In 1972, I watched my mother work incredibly hard to pass the federal ERA, but still after almost half a century it has not been ratified to the U.S. Constitution.

But, I am proud to carry on the efforts of my mother and the many individuals who have fought for women’s equality over the years by ensuring that equal rights for women becomes a reality here in Oregon.

I am voting YES on Ballot Measure 89 and I hope you will too.
Representative Val Hoyle
Oregon House Majority Leader

(This information furnished by Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo, VoteERA.org, Women’s Constitutional Equality PAC.)

Argument in Favor

The Central Oregon Coast Says Vote YES on Measure 89

Voters on the Central Oregon Coast want equality for women written into Oregon’s Constitution. We do not want to rely on case law for one of our most basic human rights. Case law is judge made law that does not always reflect the will of the people. It can erode over time as the composition of the judiciary changes. A law written into the constitution is a law written by and voted on by the people and it takes a vote of the people to change it.

Measure 89 Protects Everyone

There are a few who fear that passing the Oregon Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) may elevate the rights of women over others. They are misguided. The proposed ERA protects

all people, not just women, from sex discrimination. Also, paragraph 3 of the proposed ERA makes it clear that nothing in the Amendment will diminish the rights of persons otherwise available to them under Article 1 Section 20 or any other provision of the constitution.

Women are not fully recognized in Oregon's Constitution

Passing the Oregon Equal Rights Amendment will make clear that inequality of women is not acceptable to the people of Oregon. It will tell our mothers, wives, daughters and granddaughters that they are of equal importance and entitled to the same privileges and same responsibilities as men.

PLEASE JOIN US IN VOTING YES ON MEASURE 89

Representative **David Gomberg**
 Lincoln County Commissioner **Bill Hall**
Sandra Roumagoux, Mayor of Newport
Nancy Campbell Mead, former Circuit Court Judge
Linda Kilbride, Newport
John and Judy Kreitmeyer, Lincoln City
Michele Walters, Depoe Bay
Michele Longo Eder, Newport
Elliott and Daniella Crowder, Newport
Gary Lahman and Cynthia Jacobi, Newport
Kate Madison, Depoe Bay
Patricia Heringer, Lincoln City
Jeanne St. John, Newport
Ruth Kistler, Newport
Billie Jo Smith, Toledo
Nel Ward and Sue Hardesty, Newport
Jan Eisele, Pacific City

(This information furnished by Nancy Campbell Mead, Former Circuit Court Judge.)

Argument in Favor

Vote YES on the Oregon Ballot Measure 89 gives Oregonians the opportunity to correct a great injustice to women!

That injustice is the fact that our Oregon constitution does not give women the strongest possible protection against discrimination based on sex. In short, women in Oregon MUST have that constitutional protection. Without women's equality written in the Oregon Constitution, women will forever be in a second-class position to men. We need to pass measure 89 to make absolute sure women do not go another day without the full protection against sex discrimination in any part of their lives.

As a community activist, I see women in a myriad of roles, fighting to succeed at every level. As a former corporate board member on Portland General Electric and Oregon Physicians Service board, I know first hand that women deserve the same guarantee of equality as men.

I was appalled to learn that Oregon women were not afforded protection in our constitution from sex discrimination.

I urge all Oregonians to vote YES on Measure 89, and pass the Oregon ERA. You can feel good knowing you are positively affecting the lives of your wives, daughters, granddaughters and friends and community.

Your yes vote on measure 89 gives more than fifty percent of Oregonians recognition in Oregon's constitution; recognition that they do not currently have.

"She flies with her own wings" is Oregon's motto, but how can we fly when our wings are being clipped? I believe Oregonians are proud of their state. I'm sure we will feel even greater pride as we vote yes on Measure 89 and it passes with a strong yes vote.

I fervently ask you to join me in voting yes on measure 89 and supporting all Oregon women.

Gwyneth Gamble Booth
 Chairman of the Board, PGE Foundation
 Board President, Portland Japanese Garden
 Facilitator, The Dougy Center for Grieving Children and Families

(This information furnished by Gwyneth Gamble Booth, Chairman of the Board, PGE Foundation; Board President, Portland Japanese Garden; Facilitator, The Dougy Center for Grieving Children and Families.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON DOES NOT HAVE THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE PROTECTION AGAINST SEX DISCRIMINATION

As a former Oregon Supreme Court Justice, I strongly urge you to Vote YES on measure 89.

For over 8 years I served as an associate Justice on the Oregon Supreme Court, 10 years on the Court of Appeals and 10 years as a trial court judge. Prior to that, I was a lawyer in a law firm that admitted our first woman partner (a first for Portland) in 1968.

I signed an open letter with several of my colleagues about the Oregon ERA to support its addition to the Constitution and to point out errors some opponents have made in their criticism of this effort. You can find a copy of the open letter by visiting <http://www.VoteERA.org>.

- **As the Attorney General has made clear, no current provision in the Constitution expressly provides protections for women.**
- **Measure 89 will go farther to protect women than current judicial interpretations.**
- **Women's equality is not expressly provided in our Constitution.**

YES on Measure 89 guarantees that neither the state nor a political subdivision of the government can ever discriminate based on sex.

If you hear that the measure "is unnecessary", or there are "unintended consequences" or "concerns" that rights of others could be affected by an ERA, I can tell you there is no evidence to back up any of those assertions.

Measure 89 makes clear that nothing in the measure shall diminish any rights available to any person under the constitution. At least 22 states have adopted equal rights amendments in their constitutions. Not one of these so-called and unidentified "concerns" has ever come to pass in those states.

Measure 89 will acknowledge the contributions and importance of more than 50% of our citizens by finally providing women deserved express recognition in our state's most important document, its constitution. Please join me in voting for Measure 89.

Justice Richard William Riggs
 Retired Justice Oregon Supreme Court

(This information furnished by Justice Richard William Riggs, Retired Justice Oregon Supreme Court.)

Argument in Favor

Vote YES on Ballot Measure 89

We are proud to have the endorsements of great organizations across Oregon. Standing up for women's equality in the Oregon Constitution.

American Association of University Women (AAUW)

League of Women Voters of Oregon

Boys & Girls Club of Southwestern Oregon

Susan I. Stoltenberg, YWCA of Greater Portland

Oregon Education Association

Oregon Business Association (OBA)

Oregon NOW (National Organization for Women)

Frank Dixon, Chair, Democratic Party of Oregon

Urban League

Oregon Nurses Association

Willamette Women Democrats

Multnomah County Democratic Party

Adelante Mujeres

Oregon AFSCME

Joseph R. Esmonde - IBEW #48

Please join us in voting YES on Measure 89

*(This information furnished by Leanne Littrell DiLorenzo,
VoteERA.org, Women's Constitutional Equality PAC.)*

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

90

Changes general election nomination processes: provides for single primary ballot listing candidates; top two advance

Estimate of Financial Impact	69
Text of Measure	70
Explanatory Statement	73
Citizens' Review Statement	74
Arguments in Favor	75
Arguments in Opposition	85

Result of "Yes" Vote

"Yes" vote replaces general election nomination processes for most partisan offices; all candidates listed on one single primary ballot; two advance to general election ballot.

Result of "No" Vote

"No" vote retains current general election nomination processes, including party primaries for major parties; separate primary ballots; multiple candidates can appear on general election ballot.

Summary

Currently, each major party has a separate primary election ballot. Major party's registered voters nominate party's candidates; others' primary ballots include only nonpartisan candidates; all vote for one candidate per office. General election ballot may include multiple candidates per office: unaffiliated, major, minor party candidates. Measure replaces that system for most partisan offices, including many federal (not Presidential), all state, county, city, district offices. Single primary ballot lists all candidates for each office. Voters may vote for any candidate, regardless of voter's or candidate's party affiliation. Only top two candidates per office appear on general election ballot; may be from same party. Primary, general election ballots must contain candidates' party registration/endorsements. Eligible person, regardless of party, may be selected to fill vacancy. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

This measure changes statutes relating to primary elections. Except for the office of President, it requires that the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes advance to the general election regardless of party affiliation. The measure provides criteria for listing candidates on ballots. It establishes procedures for filling vacant Congressional offices through special elections and allows appointment to vacant state offices regardless of party affiliation. The initiative contains statutory criteria for establishing minority parties and retaining their status. It requires the Legislature to pass implementing statutes.

The Secretary of State Elections Division estimates start-up costs of \$362,640 to modify computer systems. The most likely funding source would be revenues from the General Fund.

Because of the estimated mix of costs and savings, the financial impact to counties is indeterminate.

Text of Measure

Relating to elections; creating new provisions; and repealing ORS 188.120, 248.008, 254.025, 254.056, 254.115 and 254.365.

The people, exercising their legislative authority under Article IV, section 1, of the Oregon Constitution, find as follows:

All Oregon voters should have the full and equal ability, at every election, to choose those whom they believe are best suited to govern them.

Competitive and open elections that encourage thoughtful debate and maximum participation are healthy for democracy and strengthen citizens' trust in their government.

Citizens should be able to register and affiliate with any legal political party, or none at all, according to their beliefs and without any coercion or diminishment of their rights as voters.

Political parties should be able to endorse and support any qualified candidate, or none at all, according to the beliefs and choices of their members and without any compulsion or diminishment of their rights through operations of law;

A primary election process that advances the two candidates receiving the most votes to the general election ballot, and that allows every qualified voter to vote on which candidate to advance, helps to ensure the election of officials supported by a majority of the electorate, thereby promoting citizen confidence in their government.

And therefore enact the following law:

SECTION 1. Short title. This 2014 Act may be cited as the Open Primary Act of 2014.

SECTION 2. Sections 3 to 6 of this 2014 Act are added to and made a part of ORS chapter 249.

SECTION 3. Statement of intent. The intent of the Open Primary Act of 2014 is to create a fully open, equitable, and fair election system, that will be applied to specific federal and state elected offices currently elected on a partisan basis. This Act will abolish the current practice of relying on political party members or party officials in closed primary elections or conventions to nominate candidates for these offices -- while prohibiting the participation of non-affiliated voters entirely -- and replace it with a system through which all Oregon electors may participate on an equal basis, in all phases of the selection process. This specifically means changing the current system of primary election contests for these offices so that all Oregon voters have the equal ability to select two finalist candidates to appear on the general election ballot, regardless of the political party affiliation, or lack of party affiliation, of the elector or candidate.

SECTION 4. Definition. As used in sections 3 to 6 of this 2014 Act, "voter choice office" means the office of United States Senator, Representative in Congress, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General, state Senator and state Representative and any other state, county, city or district office that is not a nonpartisan office nor an office for which nominations to the general election by political parties are expressly authorized by law.

SECTION 5. Particular provisions for voter choice offices.

(1) **Top two candidates nominated.** Except as provided in a home rule charter and subsection (2) of this section, for voter choice offices, the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes at the primary election shall be the sole candidates who advance to the general election.

(2) If three or more candidates for a voter choice office are on the ballot for a primary election and a vacancy occurs in a nomination to the office after the primary election and before the 61st day before the general election, the qualified

candidate who received the next highest number of votes at the primary election, if any, shall be the replacement nominee. The chief elections officer, as defined in ORS 254.005, shall file the name of the replacement nominee with each appropriate county clerk.

SECTION 6. Filing and nominating processes for voter choice offices. Except as provided in this 2014 Act, all provisions of state law that apply to the filing and nomination processes for candidates for nonpartisan offices, also apply to voter choice offices.

SECTION 7. Sections 8 to 10 of this 2014 Act are added to and made a part of ORS chapter 254.

SECTION 8. Definition. As used in this chapter, "voter choice office" means the office of United States Senator, Representative in Congress, Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General, state Senator and state Representative and any other state, county, city or district office that is not a nonpartisan office nor an office for which nominations to the general election by political parties are expressly authorized by law.

SECTION 9. Election ballots for voter choice offices. (1) This section is intended to give electors access to information in the public record about candidates for voter choice offices and the political parties that endorse those candidates, without infringing on the rights of political parties and their members to organize and associate.

(2) For each primary election that includes a voter choice office, the county clerk shall print on the ballot:

(a)(A) If the candidate for a voter choice office is registered as affiliated with a political party on the 70th day before the date of the election, following the name of the candidate the statement "Registration: _____" (name of political party); or

(B) If the candidate for a voter choice office is not registered as affiliated with a political party on the 70th day before the date of the election, following the name of the candidate the statement "Registration: not a member of a party" or, if the candidate chooses, no statement concerning the candidate's party registration status;

(b) The statement: "A candidate's political party registration shown on this ballot for voter choice offices indicates the candidate's party registration status as of 70 days prior to the election. It does not imply the endorsement of the political party identified,"; and

(c) For each candidate for a voter choice office, following the name of the candidate the name of any political party that has officially endorsed the candidate, preceded by the phrase "Endorsed by:", The county clerk shall print only those endorsements that have been received and accepted by the candidate and for which the chief elections officer has received notice not later than the 61st day before the date of the election.

(3) For each general election that includes a voter choice office, the county clerk shall print on the ballot:

(a)(A) If the candidate for a voter choice office is registered as affiliated with a political party on the 70th day before the date of the election, following the name of the candidate the statement "Registration: _____" (name of political party); or

(B) If the candidate for a voter choice office is not registered as affiliated with a political party on the 70th day before the date of the election, following the name of the candidate the statement "Registration: not a member of a party" or, if the candidate chooses, no statement concerning the candidate's party registration status;

(b) The statement: "A candidate's political party registration shown on this ballot for voter choice offices indicates the candidate's party registration status as of 70 days prior to the election. It does not imply the endorsement of the political party identified."

(c) For each candidate for a voter choice office, following the name of the candidate the name of any political party that has officially endorsed the candidate, preceded by the phrase "Endorsed by:". The county clerk shall print only those endorsements that have been received and accepted by the candidate and for which the chief elections officer has received notice not later than the 61st day before the date of the election.

(4) As used in this section, "political party" means a party qualified as a major or minor political party in this state under ORS chapter 248.

(5) The Secretary of State may adopt rules to implement this section.

SECTION 10. Election process for voter choice offices. Except as provided in this 2014 Act, all provisions of state law that apply to elections and ballots for nonpartisan offices, also apply to voter choice offices.

SECTION 11. Severability. Section 9 of this 2014 Act and each of its subsections, paragraphs and subparagraphs is severable from this 2014 Act. If section 9 of this 2014 Act or any subsection, paragraph or subparagraph in section 9 of this 2014 Act is held unconstitutional, the remaining parts of this 2014 Act shall remain in force.

SECTION 12. ORS 188.120 is repealed and section 13 of this 2014 Act is enacted in lieu thereof.

SECTION 13. Congressional vacancies. (1) If a vacancy in election or office of Representative in Congress or United States Senator occurs before the 61st day before the general election, the Governor shall call a special election to fill that vacancy. If a vacancy in election or office of United States Senator occurs after the 62nd day before the general election but on or before the general election, and if the term of that office is not regularly filled at that election, the Governor shall call a special election to fill the vacancy as soon as practicable after the general election.

(2) If a special election to fill the vacancy in election or office of Representative in Congress or United States Senator is called before the 80th day after the vacancy occurs, nominations to the election shall take the form of a declaration of candidacy or nominating petition, which may be filed by any otherwise eligible elector.

(3) If a special election to fill the vacancy in election or office of Representative in Congress or United States Senator is called after the 79th day after the vacancy occurs, a special primary election shall be conducted by the Secretary of State for the purpose of nominating candidates to the special election called to fill the vacancy. A declaration of candidacy or nominating petition may be filed by any otherwise eligible elector not later than the 10th day following the issuance of the writ of election.

(4) Special elections and special primary elections conducted under this section shall be as provided for voter choice offices generally, except that the Secretary of State may accept nominating petitions, declarations of candidacy and endorsements according to a schedule for filing set by the secretary, and except that, in the case of a special election held under subsection (1) of this section, the ballot shall include the names of all qualified candidates who have filed declarations of candidacy or nominating petitions.

(5) As used in this section, "voter choice office" has the meaning given that term in section 4 of this 2014 Act.

SECTION 14. Section 15 of this 2014 Act is added to and made a part of ORS chapter 236.

SECTION 15. Vacancies in voter choice offices. (1) As used in this section, "voter choice office" has the meaning given that term in section 4 of this 2014 Act.

(2) Notwithstanding ORS 171.051, 171.060, 171.068, 236.100, 236.215 and 236.217, whenever a vacancy exists in any voter choice office in this state and is to be filled by appointment, a person who is otherwise eligible may be appointed to fill the vacancy regardless of the person's affiliation or lack of affiliation with a political party, and whenever a vacancy exists in any voter choice office in this state and is to be filled by election, the election procedures for voter choice offices shall be followed.

SECTION 16. Section 17 of this 2014 Act is added to and made a part of ORS 171.051 to 171.064.

SECTION 17. State legislative vacancies. In the case of a vacancy in the office of state Senator or state Representative that is to be filled by an appointing authority as provided in ORS 171.051, the following apply:

(1) Notwithstanding ORS 171.051, an otherwise eligible person may be appointed to fill the vacancy regardless of the person's affiliation or lack of affiliation with a political party.

(2) Candidates for the remaining two years of the term of office of a state Senator under ORS 171.051 (4) shall be nominated as provided for that office in ORS chapter 249, except that the Secretary of State shall accept declarations of candidacy and nominating petitions according to a schedule for filing set by the secretary, but in any case not later than the 62nd day before the first general election to be held during that term of office.

(3) ORS 171.060 (1) does not apply to the appointment.

(4) The procedure described in ORS 171.060 (2) for a vacancy in the office of state Senator or state Representative not affiliated with a major political party applies to the appointment.

SECTION 18. ORS 254.056 is repealed and section 19 of this 2014 Act is enacted in lieu thereof.

SECTION 19. Date and purpose of general election and primary election. (1) The general election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year. Except as provided in ORS 254.650, at the general election officers of the state and subdivisions of the state, members of Congress and electors of President and Vice President of the United States as are to be elected in that year shall be elected.

(2) The primary election shall be held on the third Tuesday in May of each even-numbered year. At the primary election:

(a) Nonpartisan candidates shall be nominated or elected by all electors, as described in ORS chapter 249;

(b) Voter choice office candidates shall be nominated by all electors, as described in ORS chapter 249, for offices to be filled at the general election held in that year;

(c) In a presidential election year, delegates to nominating conventions for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States shall be selected as provided in ORS chapters 248 and 249, and precinct committeeperson shall be elected by members of major political parties; and

(d) Notwithstanding paragraph (c) of this section and ORS 248.015 (1) and (5), if the number of candidates having filed for precinct committeeperson is equal to or less than the number of positions to be filled at the primary election, no election for precinct committeeperson shall be held and all candidates having filed shall be issued a certificate of election under ORS 248.023.

SECTION 20. ORS 254.115 is repealed and section 21 of this 2014 Act is enacted in lieu thereof.

SECTION 21. Official primary election ballot. (1) The official primary election ballot shall be styled "Primary Election Ballot" and shall state:

- (a) The name of the county for which it is intended.
- (b) The date of the primary election.
- (c) The names of all candidates for nomination or election at the primary election to nonpartisan, voter choice or other offices whose nominating petitions or declarations of candidacy have been made and filed, and who have not died, withdrawn or become disqualified.
- (d) The number, ballot title and financial estimates under ORS 250.125 of any measure.
- (e) In a presidential election year, the name of each candidate for a political party nomination for President of the United States who has qualified for the ballot under ORS 249.078, and the names of candidates for election as precinct committeepersons, if required. Only votes cast by members of the applicable political party shall be tallied and published for any such contest.

(2) The ballot may not contain the name of any person other than those referred to in subsection (1) of this section. The name of each candidate for whom a nominating petition or declaration of candidacy has been filed shall be printed on the ballot in but one place. In the event that two or more candidates for the same nomination or office have the same or similar surnames, the location of their places of residence shall be printed with their names to distinguish one from another.

SECTION 22. Sections 23 and 26 of this 2014 Act are added to and made a part of ORS chapter 248.

SECTION 23. Political party nominations. Notwithstanding ORS 248.006 and 248.007 and section 25 of this 2014 Act, at the primary election, a political party otherwise authorized by law to nominate candidates through the primary election may nominate candidates only for an office for which nominations to the general election by political parties are expressly authorized by law.

SECTION 24. ORS 248.008 is repealed and section 25 of this 2014 Act is enacted in lieu thereof.

SECTION 25. Qualification for and maintenance of minor political party status. (1) An affiliation of electors becomes a minor political party in the state, a county or other electoral district, qualified to make nominations for public office in that electoral district and in any other electoral district wholly contained within the electoral district, when the affiliation of electors has acted as described in either paragraph (a) or (b) of this subsection:

(a)(A) When the affiliation of electors has filed with the Secretary of State a petition with the signatures of at least a number of electors equal to one and one-half percent of the total votes cast in the electoral district for all candidates for Governor at the most recent election at which a candidate for Governor was elected to a full term.

(B) The petition must contain only original signatures and must be filed not later than two years following the date the prospective petition is filed. The petition must state the intention to form a new political party and designate a name for the political party.

(C) Before circulating the petition, the chief sponsor of the petition must file with the Secretary of State a signed copy of the prospective petition. The chief sponsor must include with the prospective petition a statement declaring whether one or more persons will be paid money or other valuable consideration for obtaining signatures of electors on the petition. After the prospective petition is filed, the chief sponsor must notify the filing officer not later than the 10th day after

the chief sponsor first has knowledge or should have had knowledge that:

(i) Any person is being paid for obtaining signatures, when the statement included with the prospective petition declared that no person would be paid for obtaining signatures of electors.

(ii) No person is being paid for obtaining signatures, when the statement included with the prospective petition declared that one or more persons would be paid for obtaining signatures of electors.

(D) The circulator shall certify on each signature sheet that the circulator witnessed the signing of the signature sheet by each individual whose signature appears on the signature sheet and that the circulator believes each individual is an elector registered in the electoral district.

(E) The Secretary of State shall verify whether the petition contains the required number of signatures of electors. Secretary of State may not accept a petition for filing if it contains less than 100 percent of the required number of signatures. The Secretary of State by rule shall designate a statistical sampling technique to verify whether a petition contains the required number of signatures of electors. A petition may not be rejected for the reason that it contains less than the required number of signatures unless two separate sampling processes both establish that the petition lacks the required number of signatures. The second sampling must contain a larger number of signatures than the first sampling. The Secretary of State may employ professional assistance to determine the sampling technique. The statistical sampling technique may be the same as that adopted under ORS 250.105.

(b) When the affiliation of electors has polled for any one of its candidates for any public office in the electoral district at least one percent of the total votes cast in the electoral district for all candidates for:

(A) Presidential elector at the last general election at which candidates for President and Vice President of the United States were listed on the ballot; or

(B) Any single state office to be voted upon in the state at large at the most recent primary or general election at which a candidate for the office was elected to a full term.

(2) After satisfying either subsection (1)(a) or (b) of this section, the minor political party may nominate candidates for election at the next primary election for a voter choice office, as defined in section 4 of this 2014 Act, or general election for President and Vice President of the United States.

(3) A filing officer may not accept a certificate of nomination of a candidate nominated by a minor political party for a subsequent primary or general election unless the minor political party has maintained status as a minor political party as described in subsection (4) of this section.

(4) In order to maintain status as a minor political party for a subsequent primary or general election:

(a) Following each general election, at any time during the period beginning on the date of the next primary election and ending on the 90th day before the next general election, a number of electors equal to at least one-half of one percent of the total number of registered electors in this state must be registered as members of the party; or

(b)(A) Following each general election, at any time during the period beginning on the date of the next primary election and ending on the 90th day before the next general election, a number of electors equal to at least one-tenth of one percent of the total votes cast in the state or electoral district for all candidates for Governor at the most recent general election at which a candidate for Governor was elected to a full term must be registered as members of the party; and

(B) At least once in a four-year period, a candidate or candidates of the party must poll at least one percent of the total votes cast in the electoral district for all candidates for:

- (i) Presidential elector at the last general election at which candidates for President and Vice President of the United States were listed on the ballot; or
 - (ii) Any single state office to be voted upon in the state at large at the most recent primary or general election at which a candidate for the office was elected to a full term.
- (5) An affiliation of electors that fails to maintain status as a minor political party ceases to be a minor political party on the 90th day before the date of the next general election.
- (6) During the period beginning on the date of the primary election and ending on the 90th day before the date of the general election, the Secretary of State shall determine at least once each month whether registration requirements to maintain status as a minor political party have been satisfied.
- (7) If a minor political party changes its name, only those electors who register on or after the effective date of the name change as members of the party under the new party name shall be counted as members of the party.
- (8) An affiliation of electors or a minor political party may not nominate a candidate who is the nominee of another political party at the same election in order to satisfy the one percent requirement referred to in subsection (1)(b) or (4)(b)(B) of this section.
- (9) For purposes of this section, "subsequent primary or general election" means any primary or general election that is held after the first general election following qualification as a minor political party under subsection (1) of this section.

SECTION 26. Term of office of precinct committeeperson. Notwithstanding ORS 248.015, the term of office of a precinct committeeperson elected under ORS 248.015 before the effective date of this 2014 Act is four years and expires on the 24th day after the date of the primary election held in a presidential election year at which the precinct committeeperson was last elected.

SECTION 27. Repeals. ORS 254.025 and 254.365 are repealed.

SECTION 28. Captions. The section captions used in this 2014 Act are provided only for the convenience of the reader and do not become part of the statutory law of this state or express any legislative intent in the enactment of this 2014 Act.

SECTION 29. Effect. Sections 3 to 6, 8 to 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 and 26 of this 2014 Act and the repeal of ORS 188.120, 248.008, 254.025, 254.056, 254.115 and 254.365 by sections 12, 18, 20, 24 and 27 of this 2014 Act:

- (1) Apply only to appointments and elections to public office occurring on or after the effective date of this 2014 Act;
- (2) Apply to a certificate of nomination, nominating petition or declaration of candidacy filed before the effective date of this 2014 Act for an election to a voter choice office to be conducted on or after the effective date of this 2014 Act;
- (3) Apply only to vacancies occurring during terms of office where the person originally elected for the term during which the vacancy occurred was elected for that term after the effective date of this 2014 Act; and
- (4) Are not intended to require a change in the composition of any committee or commission described in ORS 137.658 or 244.250.

SECTION 30. The Legislative Assembly shall enact any legislation that may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this 2014 Act.

Explanatory Statement

Ballot Measure 90 would:

- (1) Replace Oregon's elections system for major party primaries and the nomination processes for minor parties and non-affiliated voters and candidates, for U.S. Senate, Congress, partisan state offices, and partisan local offices except those subject to city and county Home Rule;
- (2) Change the general election process for those offices; and,
- (3) Change how replacements are chosen for vacancies in those offices and elections.

The state offices affected by the measure are Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Attorney General, state Senator, and state Representative.

Measure 90 would provide for a single primary among all candidates regardless of party or non-affiliated status, in which all voters, regardless of party or non-affiliated status, may vote; the top two vote-getting candidates from the primary would advance to the general election. The two candidates who advance to the November general election could be from different political parties, the same party, or no party at all. Currently, voters choose from among any eligible candidates at the November general election, who are chosen as a result of primary election by major political parties, nomination by minor political parties, nominating petition, convention, or write-in.

Measure 90 would require that the primary and general election ballot identify the political party that candidates have selected on their voter registration. For candidates not affiliated with a party, the ballot would state either "Registration: not a member of a party" or be silent, as the candidate chooses. The ballot would also state that party registration does not imply endorsement.

Measure 90 would require that the primary and general election ballots list any endorsements by a major or minor political party that have been accepted by the candidate. Candidates at each election may be endorsed by more than one party, and parties may endorse more than one candidate.

Under current law, candidates are nominated to the November general election ballot in several ways. Major political parties choose their nominees in the primary elections. These elections are generally open only to voters registered in that party; major parties may or may not allow nonaffiliated voters to participate.

Under current law, minor political parties choose their nominees according to party rules approved by the Secretary of State. Candidates not affiliated with any party qualify for the general election ballot by gathering signatures or holding a convention. Under current law, nominees of major and minor political parties, and nonaffiliated candidates nominated independent of the parties, all appear on the general election ballot.

Under current law, a minor political party may be established or maintained by having one or more of its candidates receive a specified percentage of the votes cast at the general election for any single statewide office. Measure 90 would allow this requirement to be met at either the primary or general election for the statewide office.

Measure 90 would substitute the next finisher if a primary election qualifier drops out of the general election and provide for filling vacancies in office, regardless of party or independent status.

Committee Members:

Gregory Chaimov
Jeremy Rogers
Gregory Leo
Roy Pulvers
Lane Shetterly

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioners
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Citizens' Review Statement

This Citizens' Statement, authorized by the 2011 State Legislature, was developed by an independent panel of 19 Oregon voters overseen by the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review Commission. The panelists were randomly selected from registered voters in Oregon and balanced to fairly reflect the state's voting population based on location of residence, party registration, age, gender, education, ethnicity, and likelihood of voting. Over a period of three and a half days the panel heard from initiative proponents, opponents, and background witnesses. The panelists deliberated about the measure and produced this statement. This statement has not been edited, altered, or approved by the Secretary of State.

The opinions expressed in this statement are those of the members of a citizen panel and were developed through the citizens' review process. They are NOT official opinions or positions endorsed by the State of Oregon or any government agency. A citizen panel is not a judge of the constitutionality or legality of any ballot measure, and any statements about such matters are not binding on a court of law.

Key Findings

- Under M90, no political party could restrict non-members from voting for its candidates during the primary.
- Most elections are currently decided in low turnout primaries. Candidates have won races with as little as 7% of total voters in a district. M90 increases competition among primary candidates allowing the primary voters to vote at their discretion, regardless of party registration.
- Currently, every party has the right to have a candidate on General Election Ballot. M90 changes that and allows only the top two primary vote receiving candidates to advance to general election
- Proponents do not predict that M90 would increase voter participation. They are encouraged that M90 would give all registered voters the opportunity to vote for any candidate in primary races.
- M90 gives a real choice to more Oregonians – those Democrats and Republicans who live in districts dominated by the other party. Their party's candidates for key offices have no real chance in the General election.
- M90 could allow 499,335 Oregonians who have not registered as a Democrat or Republican to fully participate in May Primary Elections. These Oregonians represent a large and growing share of the electorate.
- M90 decreases choice in General Election for all voters.
- The Top Two system is the only election method in use throughout the country that allows only two candidates in the General Election.

Citizen Statement in Support of the Measure

Position taken by 5 of 19 panelists

- M90 treats all voters equally in every election. Regardless of how Oregonians' political views may differ every voter should have equal rights in every election. How or if they align with political parties shouldn't affect their rights as citizens.
- While all Oregon taxpayers fund the May primary election, voters who don't register as a Democrat or Republican are currently not allowed to participate in primaries of the major parties. M90 would allow any registered voters to vote for primary candidates of the major parties.
- Under M90 all registered voters would have the unrestricted right to vote for any primary candidate.
- Most elections are currently decided in low turnout primaries. Candidates have won races with as little as 7% of total voters in a district. M90 increases competition among primary candidates allowing the primary voters to vote at their discretion, regardless of party registration.
- M90 differs from the Top Two systems of California and Washington, because it allows voters to see candidates' personal party registration and all party endorsements that s/he accepts. This information helps voters understand candidates' views and allies.

Citizen Statement in Opposition to the Measure

Position taken by 14 of 19 panelists

- A broad coalition opposes M90, including at least two election reform groups, as well as major and minor political parties.
- M90 limits the voice of minority voters, minor parties, and grassroots campaigns. A diverse electorate needs choice & diversity in the General Election.
- M90 has several drafting errors. The most significant appears to eliminate minor parties. Because M90 bars parties from nominating candidates, their legal status is in jeopardy. Another error could allow candidates with more than 50% of the primary vote to automatically win their election without a November run-off.
- Home Rule counties have their own election systems independent of the statewide system. M90 could result in a confusing patchwork of contradictory election rules – candidates could have different rules in different areas of their district.
- Turnout in Primary Elections is much lower than General Elections. M90 decreases choice in the General Election for all voters. Nationwide, Primary turnout has fallen to less than 15%, including Top Two states.

Argument in Favor

This Open Primary is Simple

Here's How it Works:

1. Oregon holds primary elections in May.
2. Today, the primary election is closed, meaning Democrats can only vote for Democratic candidates and Republicans can only vote for Republican candidates.
3. Independent voters cannot vote in primaries. The Democrat or Republican candidates winning their party's primary then face off in the General Election in November.
4. A "Yes" vote for Measure 90 would change the primary election process.
5. In an open primary election, all candidates for office would be listed on the ballot and all voters can vote for any single candidate they choose. The two candidates with the most votes would advance to the General Election, regardless of party affiliation.

IN OTHER WORDS ...

1. Only Democrats and Republicans are allowed to pick candidates in our May primary election, who will move on to the November Election.
2. Right now, primary elections exclude 650,000 Oregonians who haven't chosen party labels. They can't vote at all in closed primary elections. They are locked out.
3. Democrats and Republicans, excluding any other voters, pick candidates for the General Election. Political parties control the election instead of all voters in the district.
4. A "Yes" Vote for Measure 90 ensures everyone has the right to vote in primary elections.
5. Under the open primary system, which is employed in most local races in Oregon already, all voters in a district can vote in the primary. Voters can choose any candidate they want, regardless of party. The two candidates with the most votes run in the November election.

With Measure 90, We Will:

- End the lockout of 650,000 Oregonians who are barred from voting in primary elections.
- Allow voters to select any candidate they want, regardless of party affiliation—it gives us more choices.
- Allow everyday Oregonians—instead of political party leaders—to have more power over who we elect to represent us.

Vote "YES" on Measure 90

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

Every Oregon Voter Should Have the Opportunity to Vote in Every Election, Every Time

As a former Oregon Secretaries of State and guardians of our elections system, we believe that the 650,000 Oregonians who are barred from voting in primary elections today for Oregon's most important offices should be allowed by law to cast a vote.

Measure 90 ensures that **everyone will have the full and equal right to vote.**

In every election, every Oregon voter – regardless of their particular party registration – should have an equal opportunity to choose from all candidates running for office.

Today, Republicans get a May primary ballot that only includes Republican candidates for key offices. Democrats get their version. Do you believe the best person for the job might be from a different party? Tough luck. Registered as an independent voter or a member of another party? You're locked out, period.

Vote by Mail was opposed by both the Democratic and Republican and their powerful allies during the 1980s and 1990s – until 70% of voters enacted it. Today, the Open Primary is also fiercely opposed by Oregon's political establishment, who feel threatened by this equally clear and powerful idea:

We must unlock Oregon's "members only" closed primary election.

As we learned so well during our public service, Oregonians may hold strong political views, and many are proud of affiliating with a particular party (or none at all). In fact, one of us served as a Republican, the other as a Democrat. But we are Oregonians first, who deeply care about values like freedom, choice, fair play, and equal treatment.

We Cannot Continue to Shut Out These Oregon Voters and Restrict Their Rights.

Vote Yes on Measure 90

Phil Keisling, Former Secretary of State (1991-1999)

Norma Paulus, Former Secretary of State (1977-1985)

(This information furnished by Phil Keisling, Oregon Secretary of State (1991-99).)

Argument in Favor

Newspaper Editors Researched the Issue and Encourage You to Vote Yes on Measure 90

"The top-two system makes the primary into a fair horse race between all the candidates seeking an office ... this system gives every candidate of every political stripe an equal head-to-head opportunity to win a place on the November ballot.

In Oregon, political parties desperately want to kill the top-two system. Party leaders are frantic to preserve their power. They argue that two candidates of the same party may advance to the general, depriving voters of a full spectrum of choices when it really matters.

But this is baloney. Real choice consists of voting for whom-ever you like, without the parties avidly pulling the strings."

The Daily Astorian 08/25/2014

"What voters should know before November, though, is that Measure 90 would expand voter participation and reward moderate candidates. Both are good reasons to vote 'yes.'"

The Oregonian, 08/16/2014

"In a nutshell, the big party folk and their financial enablers are happy with the status quo because it's so neat and clean. ... It works for them, but does it work for you? We join virtually every other Oregon newspaper in asserting that it does not.

Take a stand for participatory democracy. Vote yes on Measure 90."

The Yamhill Valley News Register, 08/22/2014

"An open primary would ensure that every voters' voice would matter in every election. Citizens would no longer be shut out from nominating candidates just because they declined to be identified, on paper, as either Democrat or Republican."

The Corvallis Gazette Times, 07/09/2014

"We have consistently supported the open primary concept, for good reasons. The strongest argument is that unaffiliated voters – independents with a small 'I' – may not vote in partisan primaries. That's a huge chunk of the electorate shut out of determining who will appear on the ballot in November."

The Medford Mail Tribune, 06/25/2014

Your Local Papers Did the Research, You Can Too. Visit www.90forOregon.org.

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

We are Two Independent-Minded Lawmakers from Different Parties and Different Parts of Oregon

But We Know **Measure 90 Will Help Stop Partisan Gridlock** that Today’s Closed Primaries Encourage

If You Want More Bipartisanship, Vote YES on Measure 90

I’m State Senator Chris Edwards, a Democrat from Eugene

I’m State Representative Vicki Berger, a Republican from Salem

We don’t always agree on policies, but we both agree that Measure 90 will encourage elected officials in Oregon to make decisions based on a proposal’s merits, instead of whether partisan extremists like it.

If we change the closed primary system, candidates will be forced to be accountable to all voters and not just a handful of partisans.

Measure 90 will also stop the unfair voter lockout. **Right now, 650,000 Oregon voters who have not chosen a party label are locked out from voting in our current closed primary system.** Measure 90 ensures that everyone has a right to vote in our primaries.

This seems common sense, especially because in the vast majority of local elections, everyone can vote in the primary. **It’s right and just to allow every voter the opportunity to vote in the primary election.**

Opening the primary to all Oregon voters will encourage more of our lawmakers to vote their conscience instead of just their party.

With Measure 90, We Get More BIPARTISANSHIP

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More GRIDLOCK

With Measure 90, We Get More CHOICES TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES OF ANY PARTY

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More EXTREME PARTISAN CANDIDATES

With Measure 90, We Get More INDEPENDENT THINKING

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More PARTISAN PANDERING

IF YOU WANT YOUR ELECTED OFFICIALS TO WORK ACROSS THE AISLE TO SOLVE OREGON’S BIG PROBLEMS
VOTE “YES” ON MEASURE 90.

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

The Status Quo Closed Primary System vs. Measure 90 and the Open Primary System

Decide for Yourself

Status Quo Closed Primary System

650,000 Oregon Voters Locked Out

Independent voters not allowed to vote in closed, partisan primaries

Measure 90 and the Open Primary System

650,000 Voters Finally Allowed to Vote

Independent voters are free to cast ballots in primary elections

Limited Voter Choices

Democrats can only vote for Democrats

Republicans can only vote for Republicans

It is illegal for independent voters to cast ballots

Political Parties Control Elections

Parties pick their candidates for the General Election

Rural Democrats and Urban Republicans Don’t Matter
Democrats in strong

Republican areas don’t have a say in who will win the General Election because no Democrat can win in their district

Republicans in strong Democratic areas don’t have a say in who will win the General Election because no Republican can win in their district

Independents can’t vote at all

Learn more about Measure 90, the simple change that will unlock elections for all Oregonians.

www.90fororegon.org

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

Experts Who Study America’s Political Divide Say: Open Primary Elections to All Voters

It’s no secret that Congress is broken. The question is how to fix it. There isn’t a silver bullet, but there are reforms that can get us closer to better government, like open primary elections

This past year, The Bipartisan Policy Center’s Commission on Political Reform spent 18 months studying and crafting a report to investigate the causes and consequences of America’s partisan political divide and to advocate for specific reforms that will improve the political process.

The report outlines a number of important findings.

Key among them was opening partisan primary elections to independents and/or members of other parties, arguing that to fix our broken political system “parties must engage more than just a faction within their coalition. [1]”

While open primaries are generally opposed by the political parties and by groups that fund highly partisan candidates, **open primaries are supported by many groups and individuals with a history of working across the aisle, including Oregon Congressman Kurt Schrader.**

With partisan primary elections, political parties control nominations, and ultimately who gets elected to office.

An open primary will allow average citizens to have more power over who they elect.

Oregon should help lead the way to ending partisan gridlock in Congress.

More Choices for Voters

Democrats can vote for any candidate they want

Republicans can vote for any candidate they want

Independents can vote for any candidate they want

Average Voters Control Elections

All voters pick their candidates for the General Election

All Voters, Urban and Rural, Have an Equal Vote
Democrats in strong

Republican areas will finally have a real vote in who will represent them

Republican in strong Democratic areas will finally have a real vote in who will represent them

Independents are free to cast ballots in the primary

Vote Yes on Measure 90 to open primary elections to 650,000 Oregonians who are locked out of the process.

It's fair and simple.

[1] Commission on Political Reform. A Bipartisan Blueprint to Strengthen our Democracy. June, 2014

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

ATTENTION EVERYDAY, GRASSROOTS OREGON DEMOCRATS

Your Democratic Party Leadership Dislikes Measure 90

Everyday, Hardworking Democrats Think Otherwise

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This measure is terrible for our party structure.

Everyday, Grassroots Democrats Say: The Internal party structure does not impact us or Democrats that we support. It looks like the party is afraid of change and we're not afraid of positive changes.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This concept has unknown impacts on our party. We should stick with the status quo.

Everyday, Grassroots Democrats Say: Increasingly, special interests are taking over our party. We need a change to take it back for the voters instead of those that write big checks.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This measure benefits big-money interests.

Everyday, Grassroots Democrats Say: Today, our elections are run by big-money special interests. The Democratic Party leadership controls nominations, and they don't speak for everyday, grassroots Democrats. Measure 90 will allow average Democrats - rather than the Oregon Democratic Party Leadership - to have more power over which Democrats to elect.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: Measure 90 would give Democrats fewer choices.

Everyday, Grassroots Democrats Say: Over 130,000 Oregon Democrats live in areas where only a Republican can likely win with the current gerrymandered district maps, like in Eastern and Southern Oregon. Measure 90 would give Democrats in these solid Republican districts a meaningful vote.

-Grassroots Democratic Voters Are Voting Yes on Measure 90-

(This information furnished by Brian Tosky.)

Argument in Favor

Open Primary Elections Work Great for Local Offices

Let Voters Choose Candidates with the Best Ideas Not Just Party Registration

Yes on Measure 90: General Election 2014

As community leaders who stood for election in a local, open primary election, we believe an open primary allows voters to make decisions based on a candidate's merits and ideas rather than party registration.

If you're like us, you want the smartest, most ethical, hardest working public servants working for you. That is not limited to all Democrats or all Republicans. Neither party has a corner on the market of smart, dedicated people who can solve our big problems.

Unfortunately, in Oregon today, some elections like for Congress, the state legislature and other statewide offices only let Democrats choose Democrats and Republicans

choose Republicans. Non-affiliated (independent) and minor party voters are completely shut out of these elections.

Measure 90 would implement what most local elections like mayor and county commissioner elections do today: We Let Everyone Vote.

Rather than running a campaign targeted at one party's voters, we ran campaigns reaching out to all voters. We want to do the best for all the voters in our communities and we don't have to pledge a special allegiance to one party of the other.

Today, the closed primary election excludes 650,000 Oregon voters. Elections are run to cater to what a small group of partisan voters care about.

Measure 90 is a better system. All voters will vote in a single primary and choose among all candidates. The top two candidates will advance to the general election, regardless of party.

Please join us in voting **Yes on Measure 90.**

Tony Hyde, Columbia County Commissioner

Bill Baertlein, Tillamook County Commissioner

Joshua Greene, Florence City Councilor

Mark Labhart, Tillamook County Commissioner

Chrystal Shoji, Coos Bay Mayor

Martha Schrader, Clackamas County Commissioner

Henry A. Balensifer III, Warrenton City Commissioner

Tim Josi, Tillamook County Commissioner

Bill Hall, Lincoln County Commissioner

Shirley Kalkhoven

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

*****Open Primary Research Briefing*****

Elway Research Conducted a 2008 Statewide Voter Survey in Washington State After Washington Voters Adopted an Open, Top-Two Primary.

Key Finding: 76% of Washington Voters Preferred the New System.

In August 2008, the Washington State Secretary of State's Elections Division commissioned a statewide voter survey by Elway Research.

Below are the Details from Elway Research. Call the Washington State Secretary of State's Elections Division for more information: (800) 448-4881

Voter Questions

Question: The form used for the last several years is known as "Pick a Party." In this form, you were required to first pick a party and then you were allowed to vote only for candidates of that party. In general, did you like or dislike that system?

Question: In this year's primary, known as the 'Top Two Primary,' you could vote for any candidate for each race. You were not required to pick a party. In general, did you like or dislike that system?

Key Findings:

- By almost 3 to 1, voters liked "Top Two" primary more than "Pick a Party"
- 76% of Washington voters liked the "Top Two" system more than the old system
- A solid majority of voters from all political parties preferred the new system, including Democrats and Republicans.

Elway Research Conclusions:

“These results clearly indicated that the ‘Top Two’ primary is popular across the spectrum of Washington voters. It was widely preferred to the “Pick a Party” system among every demographic and political category in this survey.”

[Find out more about how open primaries work to unlock elections for all voters at www.90fororegon.org](http://www.90fororegon.org)

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

A Message from

David Frohnmayer, Former Oregon Attorney General
Mark Frohnmayer, Equal Vote Coalition

What public policy areas do you care about? Education? The environment? The economy? Health care? **Whatever you care about, there’s something else that deserves your attention** – our system to choose the people who make all those other choices on our behalf.

We are required by the founding principles of our nation to have an equal weight vote, specifically so our government will work for us. Unfortunately this founding vision has never been realized. There are two persistent inequalities in how we vote that benefit special and partisan interests at the expense of We the People as a whole.

First, the spoiler effect: in our current system, whenever there are more than two candidates, the more similar ones split supporters’ votes, which often causes the election of a candidate without the support of the majority. As a result, we’re told not to “waste” our votes on long shots we like and instead choose only the “lesser evil” of the most heavily funded candidates. **The vote-splitting spoiler effect alone shuts out all minor party candidates and overwhelmingly advantages moneyed interests.**

The second inequality is the closed partisan primary system itself that **excludes more than half of Oregon’s voters from having a meaningful representative voice** and affords real choice only between two polarized major party candidates deep in the money’s pocket.

Are we surprised we have a disenfranchised electorate and special-interest-dominated governments mired in partisan gridlock?

M90 explicitly directs the Legislature to “create a fully **open, equitable, and fair** election system ... through which all Oregon electors **may participate on an equal basis** ... so that all Oregon voters have the **equal ability** to select two finalist candidates...” This directive unambiguously requires that **all voters be equal in all elections**. No more partisan exclusion, no more spoiler effect.

Let’s make the equal vote another significant Oregon first.

(This information furnished by Mark Frohnmayer, Equal Vote Coalition.)

Argument in Favor

Sue Levin, Chair of the Board of Stand for Children—Oregon

*Vote Yes on Measure 90 to End the Lockout,
Lets us Choose Leaders Based on Merits*

As board chair of the largest grassroots education advocacy organization in Oregon, I know that our children’s education is not a partisan issue. However, too often, lawmakers treat our schools and kids like a political football. Measure 90 will help end political gamesmanship that often prevents us from doing more for Oregon’s public schools.

Measure 90 Ends the Lockout of Thousands of Oregon Parents

In Oregon today, 650,000 Oregon voters are locked out from voting in our closed primary elections.

This is because political independents, not tied to a political party, cannot vote in the May primary elections. This is unfair, and it bars nearly one third of Oregon voters from freely choosing candidates for office. Measure 90 is an open primary that ensures everyone—regardless of party labels—has a right to vote in the primary election.

Measure 90 Helps Us Elect Leaders on Their Merits Instead of their Party Labels

This measure will allow voters to make decisions based on a candidate’s merits—for example, their support for improving and sustaining our education system—rather than their party affiliation.

All too often in closed primaries today, candidates campaign as education champions, and then get to Salem and vote along party lines. In an open primary, every voter in Oregon can vote for whatever candidate will truly prioritize education—instead of just picking from all Democrats or all Republicans.

Measure 90 Empowers Regular Voters Over Political Parties

Today, with closed, partisan primary elections, political parties control who ends up on the ballot in November, instead of all voters. Measure 90 will allow all of us to have more power over who we choose to elect—instead of continuing to allow political party insiders to control elections.

Measure 90 Will Move Education Forward. Join Me in Voting Yes.

(This information furnished by Sue Levin, Chair of the Board of Stand for Children - Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

Teamsters Local 206 supports Measure 90 because it is an issue of democracy, plain and simple. Our election system is dominated by the two major parties. It is broken and not getting any better.

Consider these facts:

FACT: Our closed primary system prevents 650,000 minor party members and non-affiliated voters from voting in the taxpayer-funded primary where up to 90% of all elections in Oregon are decided. Therefore, these 650,000 registered voters have no voice in selecting our leaders at the most important phase of the process.

FACT: The Democratic and Republican Parties draw legislative district lines to ensure that all but a very few districts are “safe” for one or the other of the major parties. By doing so they lock in very predictable election results in the primaries, and limited choice for general election voters.

FACT: At the same time, people are “voting with their feet” by choosing to NOT register as either a Democrat or Republican. In fact, 49% of young people under the age of 40 are no longer registered with either major party.

Measure 90 would allow all voters to vote when it matters, and by enhancing Oregon’s system of fusion voting, **it allows minor parties to break out of the “spoiler” role to have a meaningful impact in deciding who will lead our state.**

Measure 90 will allow minor parties, as well as Democrats and Republicans, to place endorsements of candidates directly on the ballot in both the primary and general elections. This provides voters with more information than they have now, and it gives candidates a way to clearly express their values directly to voters.

I have spent my career fighting for a bottom-up, worker-led labor movement, and I believe we need to bring those same

values to our democracy. **The board of Teamsters Local 206 voted unanimously to support Measure 90, and we urge all Oregonians to join us in voting YES on Measure 90.**

(This information furnished by Tom Leedham, Teamsters Local 206.)

Argument in Favor

What Do ...

Bob Levy, 67-Year-Old, Republican Wheat Farmer from Echo, OR
and

Sam Blackman, 38-Year-Old, Democratic Tech Entrepreneur from Portland, OR

Have in common?

(Well, not a whole lot. We certainly wear different kinds of blue jeans.)

The answer is that we both support Measure 90.

650,000 Oregonians—our friends and neighbors in urban and rural Oregon—are locked out of voting in primary elections because they aren't registered with either major party. These voters pay taxes to support primary elections, but they aren't included in them. That's not fair, and it's contributing to the disastrous partisan gridlock that is plaguing our government.

Voters that are not affiliated with either major party are the fastest growing group of Oregon voters. That means year after year we are locking out more and more people from the key decisions about who will represent their interests as elected officials.

While we are members of political parties, we don't believe that those parties should control our elections.

Voters should control elections, and all voters should be included.

Under Measure 90, all voters and candidates will be included in a single primary election for each office, with the top two advancing to the general election, regardless of political party.

That means candidates will have to compete on merits and ideas rather than on allegiance to a particular party or ideology. For most voters, including us, this will be a refreshing change.

Please join us in supporting Measure 90 so that all voters are equal in all elections and that politicians represent all of us rather than just some of us.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 90

IT'S GOOD FOR URBAN AND RURAL OREGON

Sam Blackman, CEO and Co-Founder, Elemental Technologies

**Bob Levy, Partner, Windy River and
Third Generation Oregon Farmer**

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

As Secretary of the Independent Party of Oregon, I strongly believe in protecting the rights of minor political parties and all Oregon voters. I believe that our elections work best when more people have a meaningful vote.

That is why I strongly endorse Measure 90 and the Open Primary.

Our current election system is failing us. For decades, our political system has festered with stalemate, stagnation, and an absolute failure to respond effectively to the major issues of the day.

Part of the reason is that the closed primary rewards partisanship and discriminates against the 650,000 people in

this state who are not members of either major party in the primary election.

Our current system also discriminates against the nearly 80 percent of Oregon voters – more than 1.6 million people – who live in districts that have been so badly gerrymandered that they are not seriously contested by one of the two major parties in November. In those districts, the winner is decided by a handful of partisan primary voters, leaving the rest of us without a meaningful choice on the November ballot.

The Open Primary will change that for the better. If Measure 90 passes, thousands more voters will have a meaningful choice in the general election, and for the first time in decades, a bigger voice in government.

It should come as no surprise that the party bosses who control elections in this state, and the special interests that fund them, are spending millions to defeat Measure 90.

Closed primaries, like we have in Oregon today, were designed to elect party loyalists and to allow a handful of special interests to exert undue influence over our political system. Measure 90 will take the power out of their hands and put it in the hands of all Oregonians.

Let's take back our political system and give all Oregonians an equal voice in our elections. Vote "Yes" on Measure 90.

Sal Peralta, McMinnville, Oregon

(This information furnished by Sal Peralta.)

Argument in Favor

We are **Two Independent-Minded Lawmakers from Different Parties and Different Parts of Oregon**

But We Know **Measure 90 Will Help Stop Partisan Gridlock** that Today's Closed Primaries Encourage

If You Want More Bipartisanship, Vote YES on Measure 90

I'm State Senator Chris Edwards, a Democrat from Eugene

I'm State Representative Vicki Berger, a Republican from Salem

We don't always agree on policies, but we both agree that Measure 90 will encourage elected officials in Oregon to make decisions based on a proposal's merits, instead of whether partisan extremists like it.

If we change the closed primary system, candidates will be forced to be accountable to all voters and not just a handful of partisans.

Measure 90 will also stop the unfair voter lockout. **Right now, 650,000 Oregon voters who have not chosen a party label are locked out from voting in our current closed primary system.** Measure 90 ensures that everyone has a right to vote in our primaries.

This seems common sense, especially because in the vast majority of local elections, everyone can vote in the primary. **It's right and just to allow every voter the opportunity to vote in the primary election.**

Opening the primary to all Oregon voters will encourage more of our lawmakers to vote their conscience instead of just their party.

With Measure 90, We Get More BIPARTISANSHIP

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More
GRIDLOCK

With Measure 90, We Get More CHOICES TO VOTE FOR
CANDIDATES OF ANY PARTY

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More
EXTREME PARTISAN CANDIDATES

With Measure 90, We Get More INDEPENDENT THINKING

With The Status Quo, Closed Primary, We Get More
PARTISAN PANDERING

**IF YOU WANT YOUR ELECTED OFFICIALS TO WORK ACROSS
THE AISLE TO SOLVE OREGON'S BIG PROBLEMS****VOTE "YES" ON MEASURE 90.**

*(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II,
Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)*

Argument in Favor

Dear Fellow Oregonians:

As a Columbia County Commissioner and Chair of the Association of Oregon Counties, I strongly support Measure 90 and open, nonpartisan elections. The vast majority of counties in Oregon use open nonpartisan elections to elect commissioners because they include all voters, provide more choices, and reduce political partisanship. Every year more and more counties shift to this preferred system of voting.

In the past 8 years, 10 counties have moved to nonpartisan elections for county commissioner positions including Union, Crook, Harney, Klamath, Curry, Jefferson, Lake, Lincoln, Polk, and Tillamook. Voters in these counties have passed nonpartisan election ballot measures with as much as 80% of the vote. These counties have joined Multnomah, Washington, Clackamas, Lane and most other counties in Oregon in holding nonpartisan elections.

It's time to adopt these elections for Congress, state legislature, and statewide offices.

Measure 90 is similar to nonpartisan elections for county commissioner with a few added benefits. Most importantly, under Measure 90, two candidates will always appear on the general election ballot, providing more choices to voters than local nonpartisan elections, which can be decided in the primary with 50%+1 of the vote.

Measure 90 also provides more information to voters than local nonpartisan elections. For example, the party registration of candidates will be printed on the ballot, maximizing the information that voters have to help them choose between candidates.

Measure 90 also simplifies the voting process in most counties and has the potential to save significant resources for counties. Right now, most elections for mayor, city council, school board and county commission are nonpartisan, but elections for state legislature, statewide offices and Congress are partisan. That means that counties have to send different ballots to different voters based on their party registration. With Measure 90, all voters will receive one ballot for these offices, streamlining the process for county elections offices.

I hope that you join me in supporting Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Earl Fisher, Columbia County Commissioner.)

Argument in Favor

IF YOU ARE UNDER 40, THERE IS A 49% CHANCE THAT YOU ARE LOCKED OUT OF VOTING

FOR KEY OFFICES IN PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Nearly half of us can't vote in primary elections that we pay for.

- 49% of voters under 40 [1], and more than 50% of voters 18-24 [2], are not registered as Democrats or Republicans
- These young voters (and 650,000 total voters statewide [3]) are therefore barred from voting in taxpayer-funded primary elections for key state and federal offices like Governor, U.S. Congress, and state representative.
- Young voters are part of a growing trend of Oregonians and Americans who are fed up with partisan politics

and are choosing not to associate as Republicans or Democrats.

- We should do everything we can to ENCOURAGE young voters to participate, not lock them out of the process because they are independent thinkers.
- It's time we update our election system to reflect the reality that 650,000 voters, including nearly 50% of those under 40, are not registered with a major party.

MEASURE 90 CREATES A SINGLE PRIMARY ELECTION OPEN TO ALL VOTERS AND CANDIDATES, REGARDLESS OF PARTY (OR NO PARTY AT ALL)

That's the kind of system that makes sense for Oregon's young voters who don't feel like either major party serves them well.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 90 TO END THE LOCKOUT OF NEARLY HALF OF YOUNG OREGONIANS

(Give us a break and unlock elections.)

Learn more at www.90forOregon.org

Jeremy Rogers, Age 33 Portland, Oregon

1. **Jeff Mapes. *The Oregonian*, June 6, 2014. "As Oregon voters leave the major parties, group revives proposal for nonpartisan primary."**
2. **Oregon Secretary of State Voter Registration Statistics, May 2014 Primary Election**
3. **Oregon Secretary of State Monthly Voter Registration Statistics, May 2014**

(This information furnished by Jeremy Rogers.)

Argument in Favor

Support Oregon jobs by passing Measure 90 and ending the partisan gridlock that hurts our economy

Business success depends on a government that functions well. But our election system is shutting out more than 650,000 voters and partisan politics is preventing us from making progress on critical issues.

Business success depends on quality infrastructure like roads and bridges and a world class education system that prepares students for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

But, partisan primary elections are contributing to the gridlock that is stopping us from making progress on these and other important issues.

Rather than reaching out to all voters with solutions that work for all of us, many politicians cater to the political parties and do whatever it takes to win primary elections, which only include a small number of one party's voters.

We believe that when all voters are included in primary elections, businesses will be better off because we all want the same thing: Thoughtful leaders willing to work across the aisle to solve problems.

Oregon's economy will not thrive until we end the partisan gridlock that is plaguing our country.

Please join the Medford/Jackson County Chamber of Commerce and **Vote Yes on Measure 90**

Brad Hicks, President, Medford Chamber of Commerce

(This information furnished by Brad Hicks, President and CEO, Medford/Jackson County Chamber of Commerce.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 90 Gives Us More Choices—Not More Candidates Hand-Picked by Extreme Partisans in the Closed Primary

There are many areas in Oregon that are dominated by Democrats or Republicans. In those areas, elections are

effectively decided by a small number of party members who vote in primary elections.

By allowing everyone to vote, Measure 90 ensures all voters get a say in who represents them.

Two Oregonians Explain How Their Votes Don't Really Count Today and How Measure 90 Will Help

• I'm a Democrat from a Strong Republican Area: Jim Kelly

I own a cattle ranch in Grant County with my wife. We're about 225 miles from downtown Portland. In my area, Republicans are the majority party. Being a Democrat in our closed primary system, I can only vote for Democrats, who will never win in a General Election against a Republican.

Today I have no real choice in the General Election, because a Republican will easily win my town.

Measure 90 allows Democrats, and people from all parties, to vote in primary elections, just like elections for school board or mayor. Measure 90 gives us real choices instead of being stuck with a candidate the majority party picked.

• I'm a Republican from a Strong Democrat Area: Paul Fleck

I grew up in Eugene and am a young Republican active in politics. However, Democrats are the majority party in my district. Being a Republican in our closed primary system, I can only vote for Republicans, who will never win in a General Election against a Democrat.

Today I have no real choice in the General Election, because a Democrat will easily win my town.

Measure 90 allows Republicans, and people from all parties, to vote in primary elections, just like elections for school board or mayor. Measure 90 gives us real choices instead of being stuck with a candidate the majority party picked.

Vote YES on Measure 90 for Real Choices

(This information furnished by Jim Kelly.)

Argument in Favor

Farmers, Ranchers and Foresters Support Measure 90:

AG-PAC Says Vote Yes for Oregon's Open Primary! Yes on Measure 90!

We Elect Our Agricultural Leaders Based on Their Ideas and Work Ethic, Not Party Labels

- Measure 90 Will Allow Oregonians to Vote for the Candidate with the Best Ideas, Rather Than the Party They Selected When They Registered to Vote

Can you imagine if local farm bureau elections were run like our closed primary system with Republican farmers only choosing from Republicans and Democrat farmers only choosing from Democrats? Or FFA elections? Or high school officer elections? That's ludicrous. We should have the right to vote for the best leaders from whatever party label to get the job done.

- Farmers are Democrats, Republicans and Independents: Party Labels Don't Really Matter

Farmers need their elected leaders to understand agriculture and work hard to get the job done. There are hardworking Democrats, Republicans and Independents. There are also not-as-worthy Democrats, Republicans and Independents. Just like in any other election in which we choose our leaders, we should elect candidates based on their ideals, values, ideas and follow through. Not a party label.

- AG-PAC Supports Measure 90 and You Should Too.

It's just common sense to choose leaders based on what

ideas they have to improve our communities instead of their political party.

(This information furnished by Dave Dillon, Chair, AG-PAC.)

Argument in Favor

There's Very Little the Candidates for Governor Agree On

But John Kitzhaber, a Democrat

And Dennis Richardson, a Republican

Both Support Measure 90, Oregon's Open Primary

"Richardson and Kitzhaber support the ballot initiative to open Oregon's partisan primary races"

The Salem Statesman-Journal, 7/18/14

Vote YES on Measure 90.

We must bring Oregon closer together through:

BIPARTISANSHIP

UNLOCKING ELECTIONS FOR 650,000 OF US WHO ARE BARRED FROM PRIMARY ELECTIONS TODAY

GIVING VOTERS THE CHOICE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE THEY WANT, REGARDLESS OF PARTY LABEL

It's pretty simple. Learn more about how you can help bring Oregon together at www.90fororegon.org

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS SUPPORT MEASURE 90 TO PROTECT OUR SCHOOLS

Our fellow Oregon voters,

As a nonaffiliated voter, school board member and retired superintendent, I have depended on our elected leaders in government to make tough, bipartisan decisions to reduce class sizes, add elective courses and extend the school year.

Sometimes, that means elected leaders must cross party lines to do what's right instead of what's popular with political special interests.

Unfortunately, our current closed primary system encourages your elected leaders to vote with the powerful special interests instead of making decisions for the people they represent. When elected officials choose to vote with the people instead of these special interests, they are often threatened with more partisan opponents in a primary election.

The threat of a "primary challenge" from a Democrat or Republican who will vote more strictly with their party will continue to dog independent thinking lawmakers who dare to stand up to special interests on the far right and far left.

I support Measure 90 because our government leaders should be elected on their ideas and merits instead of their party. Our closed party system benefits political parties and the political establishment instead of students and parents in our communities.

It's also unfair that over 650,000 Oregon voters are prevented from voting in Oregon primary elections.

Many of these "locked out" voters, including myself, are parents of schoolchildren who care about how their elected officials vote on school policies. They have no say over who ends up on the ballot in the general election. We all deserve a say, just like all school elections. Everyone should have the opportunity to vote on candidate races that impact their schools and all Oregonians.

Please Vote for Measure 90 to Support and Respect Our Schools and Parents,

Douglas M. Nelson, Ed. D

Retired Superintendent Bend, La Pine Schools

Board Member, High Desert ESD and the Oregon School Boards Association

(This information furnished by Douglas M. Nelson, Ed.D, Retired Superintendent, Bend La Pine Schools, Board Member, High Desert ESD and the Oregon School Boards Association.)

Argument in Favor

As the old saying goes, “he who writes the rules wins the game.” When it comes to our election system, the rules are written by the two major parties.

I am a leader in my union, the International Union of Operating Engineers. Our union members built the bridges, roads and offices on the Portland metropolitan skyline. They also maintain the Columbia River channel to allow the import and export cargo shipping that drives commerce in the region. When you see a construction crane or a piece of heavy machinery on a worksite, there is a good chance you will find a union operating engineer behind the controls.

Based on my experience, there is one thing I can say with absolute certainty: Working people are held hostage by our current political system, which is designed to benefit the more powerful forces of the two major parties. Working people’s issues will never rise to the forefront in such a system.

Our current closed primary system has excluded far too many people for far too long. It’s time we elevate a new set of diverse voices to help set the governance agenda of the state.

Measure 90 will allow members of minor parties — as well as non-affiliated voters — to cast a meaningful vote in the primary. I used to be registered as a member of the Working Families Party, but had to re-register as a Democrat in order to receive a ballot with more inspiring options than just voting on 20 non-partisan judge positions. Measure 90 would let me and those like me register as a minor party member, while still having a meaningful impact in setting the election agenda in the primary when it actually matters.

As a fifth generation Oregonian, I believe we need more voices in politics and we need to break the ways in which our system is rigged against working people, which is why I’m voting yes for Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Nelda Wilson, Business Manager & Financial Secretary, International Union of Operating Engineers, L701.)

Argument in Favor

ATTENTION EVERYDAY, GRASSROOTS OREGON REPUBLICANS

Your Republican Party Leadership Dislikes Measure 90

Everyday, Hardworking Republicans Think Otherwise

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This measure is terrible for our party structure.

Everyday, Grassroots Republicans Say: The Internal party structure does not impact me or the Republican candidates that I support. It looks like a handful of party members are just guarding their turf.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This concept has unknown impacts on our party. We should stick with the status quo.

Everyday, Grassroots Republicans Say: Republican candidates in Oregon haven’t won a statewide election for over a decade. Things can’t get any worse for Republican candidates. We need a change.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: This measure benefits big-money interests.

Everyday, Grassroots Republicans Say: Today, our elections are run by big-money special interests. The Republican Party leadership controls nominations, and they don’t speak for everyday, grassroots Republicans. Measure 90 will allow average Republicans - rather than the Oregon Republican Party Leadership – to have more power over which Republicans to elect.

The Insider Party Leadership Says: Measure 90 would give Republicans fewer choices.

Everyday, Grassroots Republicans Say: Over 225,000 Oregon Republicans live in areas where only a Democrat can likely win with the current gerrymandered district maps, like in Portland, Eugene and Ashland. Measure 90 would give Republicans in these solid Democratic districts a meaningful vote.

(This information furnished by Jacob Daniels.)

Argument in Favor

Preserving Oregon’s Rivers and Natural Spaces Is Not a Party Issue, It’s a Legacy Issue

Measure 90 Will Allow Us to Elect People Who Prioritize Conservation No Matter Their Party

Our river systems are the backbone of agriculture, industry and recreation. Yet millions of river miles across the United States fail to fully support aquatic life. Over the last 50 years, human impacts have altered stream habitat, resulting in poor water quality and damaged ecosystems – creating a significant need to restore them.

We can’t fix rivers by ourselves. We need partners in government, whether they are Democrats, Republicans, Independents or members of minority parties, to prioritize revitalizing our rivers and other natural spaces.

Today, with Oregon’s closed primary election, candidates of both parties are forced to cater to the far right or far left wings of their parties.

Too many times, the extreme partisans who control primary elections are either:

- Opposed to any new environmental protections; or
- Opposed to anything short of drastic, unrealistic regulations.

There is a third, more sane and preferable option when it comes to crafting sensible, forward-thinking environmental policies, and Measure 90 makes it possible.

When we unlock our primary elections and allow all Oregon voters to cast ballots in primary races, citizens will choose who they elect instead of political parties. All too often, political party extremists on both sides of the aisle threaten our elected officials with an opponent who will cater to their purist party values.

This type of partisan polarization produces gridlock on key environmental policymaking and limits choices for voters.

In Oregon, a voter should have the right to vote for any candidate that prioritizes our rivers and natural spaces. Measure 90 makes that possible.

Our Rivers and Natural Spaces Deserve Bipartisan Support.

Measure 90 Makes it Possible. Please Vote Yes on Measure 90.

(My leadership with the Freshwater Trust is for identification purposes only)

(This information furnished by Joe Whitworth, President, The Freshwater Trust.)

Argument in Favor

California's Open Primary Experience: **Academic Research Briefing**

Researchers from the University of Southern California, American University and the California Institute of Technology Examined the Impacts of the Open Primary in California that Was Implemented in 2012.

Below are excerpts from studies conducted to determine whether the open primary worked in California to reduce political polarization.

Christian R. Grose, 2014. "The Adoption of Electoral Reforms and Ideological Change in the California State Legislature." University of Southern California, Price School of Public Policy, Schwarzenegger Institute Research Report. February 24, 2014.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Early evidence suggests electoral reforms in California are associated with an ideological shift in the State Legislature, toward the center.

Since the introduction of top-two primaries and independently drawn district lines, the Legislature is becoming more moderate and less polarized.

Since the reforms took effect:

- Senators and Assembly members are more moderate overall, and
- Polarization between the two parties, as demonstrated by an analysis of members' votes, has been reduced by 15 percent in the Assembly and 10 percent in the Senate.

Christian R. Grose, J. Andrew Sinclair, and Antoine Yoshinaka. 2014. "Do Electoral Institutions Matter? The Top-two Primary and Ideological Change in the California State Legislature." Paper presented at the University of California Berkeley IGS Symposium "California's Top Two Primary."

Political Polarization in the California Legislature Before and After the Electoral Reforms

Using these legislator ideology scores, we examine the extent of ideological polarization in the California Legislature before the reforms were implemented (2011) and following the reforms (2013). The empirical evidence suggests that political polarization has been reduced in both the Assembly and the Senate in 2013 when compared to 2011.

- The evidence we have offered so far clearly demonstrates the California Legislature is more moderate and less polarized across the political parties in 2013 than in pre-reform 2011.
- The top-two is more than just an open primary – the potential for a same-party runoff gives the election another path towards rewarding moderation.

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

OREGON SMALL BUSINESS LEADERS ENCOURAGE YOU TO VOTE YES ON MEASURE 90

All Candidates Should be Weighed on Merits and Ideas Not Just Party Labels

We're small business owners in Oregon. We're not political party leaders or lobbying groups. We employ hundreds of friends and neighbors in towns across Oregon. We support Measure 90, the Oregon Open Primary Measure because:

- We work hard to grow our businesses and provide opportunities for our employees. That takes cooperation and input from everyone in the company. This type of cooperation and inclusiveness is sorely lacking in Salem and Washington D.C.
- Oregon's closed partisan primary system excludes 650,000 voters. Many of us and our employees have

not chosen a party, but that doesn't mean we should be barred from joining other Oregonians in deciding who will represent us. Measure 90 will allow every Oregon voter the opportunity to vote in primary elections.

- Oregon's closed primary system encourages candidates to toe the party line instead of reaching across the aisle and doing what's right for all of us.
- Business success depends on a well-functioning government. But partisan gridlock in Salem and in Washington D.C. has made it increasingly hard for elected officials to work together to craft and execute bipartisan plans to support our communities.
- Measure 90 creates a single primary election among all voters and candidates for each office, with the top two vote-getting candidates advancing to the general election, regardless of political party. This means all voters can participate and choose their favorite candidate, and politicians will be accountable to all voters.

We Respectfully Ask You to Join Us in Voting Yes on Measure 90 to Include All Oregonians in Election Decisions and to Put the Power of People and Ideas Over Political Parties

Peter Roscoe, Owner, Fulios Pastaria and Tuscan Steak House (Astoria, Oregon)

Bryan Steelman, Owner, ¿Por Que No? Taqueria (Portland, Oregon)

Cheri Helt, Owner, Zydeco Kitchen and Cocktails and Co-Chair, Bend-La Pine School Board (Bend, Oregon)

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Favor

Independent Voters of Oregon, known as "IVOO", is an association of independent and independent-minded voters. Neither a political party nor a traditional government reform group, IVOO is dedicated to the proposition that all voters are created equal.

What does this mean? It means that no voter should be compelled to join a political party to exercise his or her right to vote, and that federal, state, county and municipal governments belong to the people, not the parties. Further, it means that we need to re-engineer the primary system to take into account the fact that 30 percent of Oregon voters -- or 663,197 -- are excluded from voting in the primaries. On this basis, IVOO enthusiastically endorses Ballot Measure 90, the Open Primary Initiative.

IVOO is part of the national movement that targets partisanship as the Number One cause of our stalled democracy. IndependentVoting.org, the national association of independent voter groups to which IVOO belongs, has organizations in 40 states.

Partisan primaries are a recipe for partisanship! And partisanship thwarts innovation, stifles free-thinking, and prevents new progressive coalitions from forming. This must change!

Partisan primaries are taxpayer funded, yet they excluded hundreds of thousands of taxpayers from participating in what is often the decisive first round of elections! This also must change.

The latest Gallup poll reports that 42 percent of Americans consider themselves independent. Among young Americans the percentage is higher. Pew Research Center surveys show that half (50 percent) of youth ages 18 to 33 now describe themselves as political independents. In Oregon, where voter turnout among young people is 6 points higher than the rest of the country, 40 percent of young voters are independents. These young voters must have a meaningful place in the system.

Rather than trying to foster a particular outcome—like more moderation in the legislature—IVOO support for Measure 90

is based on a desire to end exclusion and give everyone an equal vote.

Vote Yes on Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Dave Ellis, Independent Voters of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

If the two party political system is working for you stop reading this statement right now. For the rest of us, let's consider a different way of organizing our elections. Measure 90 makes several important fixes to our broken election system.

The leadership of the Working Families Party has voted to support Measure 90 for two simple reasons:

1. **Our members are locked out.** Registered WFP members—along with members of other minor parties and non-affiliated voters—make up the 650,000 Oregonians who are currently prohibited from voting in our closed primary system, even though up to 90% of all races in the state are settled in the primary.
2. **Measure 90 allows minor parties to play more than just the election “spoiler.”** Measure 90 strengthens Oregon's system of “fusion voting” which allows minor political parties to participate meaningfully in elections by making on-the-ballot endorsements of candidates that share our values.

As a minor party, the WFP is keenly aware of the ways in which election rules have historically been used to marginalize minor parties. However, we believe Measure 90 opens up space for more voters and more parties to impact the governance of our state.

The two major parties have drawn so many “safe” legislative districts in the state that it is often the case that one of the major parties does not even bother to run a candidate—or they run a very weak candidate—in many parts of Oregon.

Therefore, it is not hard to imagine that under Measure 90 a member of a conservative-leaning minor party could advance to the second round of voting in a rural district, or that a progressive-leaning minor party candidate could advance in an urban area. **This creates real competition while removing the general election “spoiler” trap faced by minor parties under our current system.**

For these reasons, the WFP proudly supports Measure 90, and we urge Oregonians to join us in **voting YES**.

(This information furnished by Steve Hughes, State Director, Oregon Working Families Party.)

Argument in Favor

Don't be Fooled: Measure 90 is Legal, Straight Forward and Simple

A message from

The Honorable Lyle C. Velure

Retired Circuit Court Judge of the State of Oregon

As a retired circuit court judge, I spent part of my career examining facts in cases that had profound impacts on Oregonians' lives. I've considered the legal arguments that Measure 90's partisan opponents are making, and they are simply false.

It's a shame that the moneyed special interests that run entrenched political institutions are attempting to convince fellow citizens to oppose Measure 90 on the basis of fear, uncertainty, doubt, and unsupportable, unverified legal analysis.

Measure 90's opponents have recently presented voters with supposed “drafting errors” contained in the measure. If their

attorney had presented these flimsy arguments in my courtroom I would have determined that such arguments have no weight. None of the legal theories that the opponents have presented hold water.

My guess is that opponents do not have any good reason for shutting out 650,000 Oregonians from our primary elections, other than protecting their stranglehold over election results.

Instead, they created questionable legal arguments to distract voters from the real issue: they don't want independent thinkers messing with *their* elections.

Measure 90 is clear, straightforward and simple:

- Minor parties will not be eliminated;
- There will be a primary and a general election in each race; and
- Our elections system will be less complicated and more unified than it is today.

Don't be fooled by flimsy and baseless legal arguments. These days you can hire a lawyer to say just about anything.

We're smarter than that.

Measure 90 is a clear, simple way to allow all Oregon voters to choose whom they want to vote for—regardless of party labels. It just makes sense.

(This information furnished by Lyle C. Velure, Retired Circuit Court Judge.)

Argument in Opposition

I used to support the Top Two system, but when I saw it in practice in other states, I changed my mind.

I support the goals of an open primary; giving voters more choices, pushing candidates to the center, and increasing voter participation. Unfortunately the initial evidence from our neighboring state says that the open primary not only does not accomplish these goals, it makes it worse.

Top Two elections don't reduce partisanship. At best, what we've seen in California and Washington is no discernible change to the power of the major political parties. There is no evidence that candidates are becoming any less extreme or any more representative of their districts.

Top Two does not provide more voter choice.

Results-to-date show that minor parties are virtually eliminated from the fall ballot, when more people vote, reinforcing the exclusive power of the major parties.

In other states, we've seen the Top Two lead major party leaders to start making candidate selections in private, well before primary voters even weigh in.

Top Two elections don't increase voter turnout. In California and Washington, the turnout trend in primaries has only continued dropping. More than twice as many people vote in November as do in the primaries, even with a Top Two primary. However these additional voters have a much restricted choice and no way of showing their real preference. They can't even vote for a write-in candidate.

At the very least, we should wait to see how this unfolds in California and Washington. So far, the proponents' hopes have been unfulfilled. Maybe the systems will improve, but until then we shouldn't rush to join in their unpromising experiment.

I'm voting No on Measure 90.

John Calhoun
Managing Partner,
InsideValuation Partners LLC

(This information furnished by John Calhoun.)

Argument in Opposition

Fellow Oregonians,

I strongly urge you to VOTE NO on Measure 90.

We all want government to work better; we all want our elected leaders to work together. However, Measure 90 is definitely not the solution to solve political party friction.

This measure would severely limit the choices available to voters on the General Election ballot. Minor party voices would be silenced and voters would often be forced to choose between just two candidates from the same party.

Under this proposed election scheme, Democrats could be forced to either vote for a Republican in many races, or not vote at all. In other districts, Republicans could find their only choice is a Democrat in the fall election.

California and Washington have tried this experiment. We should learn from their mistakes.

In Washington State in the fall election, Congressional District 4 voters will have to choose between two conservative Republicans with almost identical platforms. The nearly 80,000 people who voted for a Democrat in 2012 will have no candidate who represents them on the 2014 ballot.

California's Congressional District 31 faced an equally limited voter choice in 2012. This Democratic-majority district fielded

four Democratic candidates. Only two Republicans entered the race. Democrats split the vote, clearing the way for both Republicans to win the primary contest.

That is not choice. It is not democracy. And there is nothing "open" about this new election proposal.

"Multi-party primary" election campaigns would begin earlier, be more costly, promote voter confusion, and frequently create fall elections with fewer choices for Oregon voters, including effectively forcing minor parties off Oregon's November ballot.

If the well-intentioned aim of Measure 90 is a more moderate, "play-nice" legislature, this clearly misses the mark. It is an experiment in wishful thinking.

The losers will be Oregon voters with diminished electoral choices.

Please join me in voting No on Measure 90. It is not a solution.

Governor Barbara Roberts

(This information furnished by Governor Barbara Roberts.)

Argument in Opposition

Check the Facts: Minor Parties Will Thrive Under Measure 90

The information being portrayed about the impact of Measure 90 on minor parties is simply inaccurate.

Myth: Measure 90 Shuts Out Minor Parties

This is simply not true.

Facts on Open Primaries: In the 2014 May primary, 14 minor party candidates advanced to the general election in Washington legislative races under a top-two primary system.

These minor party candidates will now be running against one other candidate, where they actually have a chance of winning rather than just acting as a third candidate spoiler in an election that is really between the candidates of the two major parties.

Measure 90 is even more favorable to minor parties.

Under Measure 90 minor parties can field their own candidates in the primary election AND minor parties can cross-endorse in the primary and general election to help voters distinguish between multiple Democrats or Republicans.

Under current law, minor parties are not included in primary elections at all. They can only access the general election ballot through petition or nominating convention (unlike major party primaries, under the current system minor parties don't have the benefit of publicly funded primaries).

Under Oregon's current system a minor party candidate has not won a general election in an Oregon legislative race since 1974.

That's why Measure 90 is strongly supported by leaders of Oregon minor parties.

"As Secretary of the Independent Party of Oregon, I strongly believe in protecting the rights of minor political parties and all Oregon voters. I believe that our elections work best when more people have a meaningful vote. That is why I strongly endorse Measure 90 and the Open Primary." Sal Peralta

"Working Families Party endorses top-two primary initiative on Oregon's ballot." Jeff Mapes, The Oregonian. July 25, 2014. <http://bit.ly/1tas6sl>

Don't be fooled by the rhetoric. Check the facts. Visit www.90forOregon.org to learn more about Measure 90 and how it supports minor parties.

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90 Campaign Committee.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Republicans say VOTE NO on Ballot Measure 90

The Oregon Republican Party opposes Measure 90 in its entirety!

Oregon already has a competitive elections system that allows for voters to choose the parties and candidates that best speak to their values. The right of voters to have meaningful choices on the ballot, and the right for political parties to nominate candidates, are fundamental to our political freedom.

Measure 90 deprives many voters the opportunity to choose between candidates from different parties to determine who will represent them.

Measure 90 will make candidates' beliefs less clear to Oregon voters.

Measure 90 has the immediate effect of freezing out minor party candidates from the general election. Two candidates of the same party can even be on the general election ballot.

Contrary to the claims of supporters of Measure 90, this measure will impair thoughtful debate, preventing a clear understanding of where candidates stand on the issues.

- Measure 90 violates your right of free association. "The right to associate for the election of candidates is fundamental to the operation of our political system." (US Supreme Court). Under Measure 90, smaller political parties will be driven out of existence.
- Measure 90 is confusing, poorly drafted, and will create unintended consequences which will discourage voter participation in elections.
- Measure 90 violates your right to vote for the candidate of your choice in the general election and eliminates write-in votes and minor party candidates in the General Election.

The Oregon Republican Party firmly believes that Oregon voters are best served and more likely to vote when the debate of vital public policy issues includes all points of view and vigorous competition. Organized groups of voters should be allowed to vet and hold candidates accountable for upholding the principles they promised to support.

The Oregon Republican Party urges you to Vote NO on Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Art Robinson, Chairman, Oregon Republican Party.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Nurses Say NO to Measure 90

The Oregon Nurses Association represents nearly 12,000 registered nurses across the state. We advocate on behalf of our members and their patients, who come from every walk of life. Our core values are integrity, respect, mutual support and professional excellence.

We're opposing Measure 90 because it would take away the choices available to all voters in the General Election, and would limit the voices of young people, communities of color, new voters, and single, working parents in our electoral process.

Measure 90 would not increase turnout

Despite the claims from the backers of this measure, Top Two elections do not increase voter participation. In fact, Primary Election voter turnout in Washington and California has actually dropped since they adopted Top Two elections.

Measure 90 would give dramatically more power to Primary Election voters, who as a group are older, less-diverse, and wealthier than General Election voters and the population as a whole. This narrow group of voters would have the power

to limit choices for all voters in the General Election. That means fewer choices and less of a voice for younger, working voters who tend to only vote in the General.

We need an elections system that works for everyone, not just a smaller and smaller group of voters. That means preserving choices for voters when it counts the most—in the fall election.

Measure 90 would shut minor parties and independent candidates out of the fall election. Voters would be forced to choose between just two candidates, who will almost always be from the two major political parties, sometimes with only a "choice" between two candidates from the same party.

Of all the Primary Elections systems in use throughout the country, the Top Two is the only one that limits voter choices in the General Election.

Oregon Nurses urge you to vote No on Measure 90.

Sarah Baessler
Oregon Nurses Association

(This information furnished by Sarah Baessler, Director of Health Policy and Government Relations, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote No on Measure 90!

It SHOULD be Illegal for 650,000 Oregonians to Vote

We, the political establishment, moneyed special interests and lobby groups of Oregon from the far right and the far left control politics.

We like it that way.

We control a lot of the groups that you trust, too, because we have enough money to fund pretty much every interest group in Oregon.

We can only maintain our control over elections and political candidates when we keep out independent voters, who think for themselves.

We only want our party loyalists to vote in closed primaries, because they will elect people to do our will in the State Capitol and Congress.

WE DON'T WANT INDEPENDENT THINKERS, ANY OF THE 650,000 OF THEM, ENDING OUR STRANGLEHOLD ON ELECTIONS.

We've excluded 650,000 voters from OUR elections in OUR Oregon.

The number of Oregon voters we have prevented from voting in OUR primary elections:

- Could Fill Autzen and Reser Stadiums 6.5 Times
- Is More Than the Entire Population of the City of Portland
- Could Fill the Moda Center, Where the Blazers Play, 32 Times
- Is *More* than the *Entire Populations* of the Cities of Bend, Eugene, Beaverton, Baker, Corvallis, Astoria, St. Helens, Coos Bay, Prineville, Roseburg, Ashland, Medford, Madras, Grants Pass, John Day, Klamath Falls, Florence, Newport, Hubbard and Heppner COMBINED.
- Is the Number of Oregonians Who Purchase Fishing Licenses Annually

Now you know the real reason why you should VOTE NO on Measure 90.

Keep the independent thinkers out of OUR elections in OUR Oregon.

www.voteno90.com

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 90 takes away your choice.

Imagine a store where you can buy Coke, Pepsi, juice, energy drinks, water, and many other beverages. But you go back to the store in November and can only buy Coke or Pepsi. Or even worse, only Coke and Diet Coke. You don't drink soda, but that's all they have because Coke and Pepsi were the most popular beverages earlier in the year.

You wouldn't put up with a store that didn't let you buy juice because it wasn't one of the top two beverages. Why put up with it when choosing political leaders?

How much choice do you have when the only two candidates on the ballot in November are two Democrats, two Republicans, or one of each?

That's what happens in California and Washington where only two candidates on Election Day is the law. General elections have only two candidates, often from the same party: two Democrats or two Republicans!

Robber barons in the 1800s passed laws to give themselves an economic monopoly. They used laws to corner the market, raise prices and rake in lucrative profits – without competition getting in their way.

Proponents of Measure 90 want a political monopoly. They want to shield their favored candidates – usually incumbents – from competition. They want to pander to their special interest pals – without political challengers getting in their way.

Proponents claim Measure 90 will increase voter turnout in primary elections. But after California passed this law, the 2014 primary election had the lowest voter turnout in history.

Measure 90 greases the skids for incumbents and multi-millionaires while practically outlawing grassroots candidates who offer voters fresh choices from new political parties, Democratic and Republican challengers, independents, and write-in candidates.

Many measures could substantially improve voter participation, but Measure 90 will make things worse. It hands elections to incumbents, millionaires, and elites while silencing the voice of everyday workers, taxpayers and citizens.

Vote No on Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Nicholas Sarwark, Libertarian National Committee.)

Argument in Opposition

Before You Read the Statements Against Measure 90, Consider the Myths and Facts Below

Measure 90 Myth

This measure gives voters fewer choices

Measure 90 Facts

Measure 90 actually creates more choice in the General Election. The idea that voters have "choice" in the General Election under the current system is a farce.

In Portland, whoever wins the Democratic primary wins the General Election. It doesn't matter who else is on the ballot. Same thing for Republicans in rural Oregon.

Under Measure 90, all voters will have a real choice between two candidates in the General Election. They may be from the same party, but that's a real choice for all the voters in the district to make instead of just one party's primary voters and party insiders.

Measure 90 Myth

This measure will bring more money into politics

Measure 90 Facts

Big donors own elections today because they can essentially fund their own candidate in a closed primary where a campaign only pays to appeal to a small number of partisan voters. With an open primary, the wealthy individuals and special interests who write big checks, lose.

Measure 90 Myth

Open primaries have failed voters in California and Washington

Measure 90 Fact

In 2008, after Washington voters adopted an open primary, Washington's Secretary of State surveyed voters to gauge satisfaction with the open primary. 76% of Washington voters liked the "Top Two" system more than the old system.

In California, three academic researchers from the University of Southern California, the California Institute of Technology and American University examined the impacts of California's new open primary. They found, "The empirical evidence suggests that political polarization has been reduced in both the Assembly and the Senate in 2013 compared to 2011."

Christian R. Grose, J. Andrew Sinclair, and Antoine Yoshinaka. 2014. "Do Electoral Institutions Matter? The Top-Two Primary and Ideological Change in the California State Legislature."

Get more facts at www.90fororegon.org

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90.)

Argument in Opposition

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon Urges You To Vote NO on Measure 90 to Protect Your Voice

By limiting election choices to just two candidates in the fall, Measure 90 would deny many voters the ability to vote for candidates who truly represent their values and positions.

In many legislative races, voters would be forced to choose between two candidates from just one party—with very similar platforms. In many races, that will mean that voters will only be able to choose between two candidates who both oppose women's right to reproductive choices.

The negative impacts on women's health are already clear in Washington, a "Top Two" state. Because of the Top Two, voters in the state's 4th Congressional District this fall will have their choice of voting between:

- **Conservative Republican Clint Didier**, who is anti-choice, or
- **Conservative Republican Dan Newhouse**, who is anti-choice.

And those will be the only choices available to voters in the congressional race, thanks to the Top Two. Pro-choice voters in the district will be forced to choose between one of these anti-choice candidates, or simply not vote at all.

As Choice Advocates, It's Critical That We Protect Our Voice and Protect Our Vote

Across the country, there have been more attacks on our reproductive freedoms in the past three years than in the entire previous decade. Voters are ready to defend women's health champions — and defeat politicians who want to turn back the clock on women's access to health care.

When politicians dismiss and demean women's health, we believe they should pay for it at the ballot box. But that can't happen if our only options are two anti-choice candidates.

Please Join Us In Voting NO On This Measure To Protect The Voice Of Pro-Choice Voters

Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon

(This information furnished by Meghan W. Moyer, Campaign Manager/Protect Our Vote Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

SEIU Local 503 and 49 Ask You to Vote No on Measure 90 Measure 90 Would Give Even More Power to Corporate Interests

This measure was put on the ballot and is being funded by a small handful of **wealthy individuals, corporate CEOs, and the biggest corporate lobbying groups in the state.**

These special interests want to rewrite the rules of our elections in order to make it easier for them to elect politicians who side with their narrow corporate agenda at the expense of working people.

Measure 90 Limits the Voices of Working People

Working people often participate less in primary elections because they are busy. But under Measure 90, the power to make most of the important political choices will be given just to primary election voters, who tend to be less diverse and wealthier than general election voters.

We don't want a system where very few voters will have the power to pick just two candidates for the rest of us. We need real choices for the majority of people who only have time to vote once a year.

Measure 90 Would Silence Grassroots Campaigns

In order for working Oregonians to have voice, we need candidates who know what it is like to care for a family, struggle to make ends meet, and go to work every day. Measure 90 will shut out candidates of modest means by increasing the cost of elections.

Only the most well-funded candidates would make it through the Top Two primary. Grassroots campaigns and a citizen legislature will be a thing of the past. That is why corporate CEOs are kicking in big money to pass the measure.

The 60,000 members of SEIU Local 503 and Local 49 ask you to vote NO on Measure 90.

(This information furnished by Matt Swanson, SEIU State Council.)

Argument in Opposition

Join the Protect Our Vote Coalition in Voting NO on Measure 90

We're a broad coalition of organizations and businesses across Oregon who oppose Measure 90. This flawed measure would take away voters' choices, shut out minor parties, and limit the voices of young people and new voters.

Oregon State Firefighters Council
Oregon Nurses Association
Oregon Education Association
Alliance for Democracy
Pacific Green Party of Oregon
The Main Street Alliance of Oregon
Oregon AFL-CIO
Oregon Progressive Party
American Federation of Teachers-Oregon
Democratic Party of Oregon
Oregon Republican Party
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
PCUN (Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste)
SEIU Local 503
SEIU Local 49
Planned Parenthood Advocates of Oregon
UFCW Local 555

Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters
Oregon AFSCME
Our Oregon
Working America
Oregon State Building Trades Council
Economic Fairness Oregon
Joint Council of Teamsters #37
Oregon School Employees Association
Strictly Organic Coffee Co.
Ballot Access News
The Free and Equal Elections Foundation

Go to NoOnMeasure90.org to learn more and join the coalition!

(This information furnished by Meghan W. Moyer, Campaign Manager/Protect Our Vote Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon AFSCME is **opposed to Measure 90** and the effort to replace our election system based on the whims and speculation of a handful of the very rich.

The measure throws away the way we elect candidates and sets up a system where elections will cost more and voters will have less choice in the general election. The handful of people who vote in the primary will have far more power.

The members of AFSCME believe that having less choice when more people vote is a recipe for less democracy and that is something we cannot support.

If we want to fix the problems with our democracy, we should increase participation by making it easier to register to vote. We should all work to engage more voters in the process, not push elections away from the majority of people, which is what would happen under Measure 90.

This measure was drafted by lobbyists with no input from the public. Because of that, the measure has a series of serious flaws that the proponents don't want to talk about.

This measure is ripe for playing games. The supporters, who are almost entirely millionaires, CEOs, and corporate lobbyists, want to seem bi-partisan and make this about good government but it is so easily manipulated that they will be the only winners.

Measure 90 will make elections more expensive and make it impossible for working people to run for office. Only people who can afford to not work for a year or make all their money in investments would be able to run for office. The fact that elections will cost so much more money will force candidates to be even more beholden to moneyed interests.

Please VOTE NO and don't make elections the exclusive playground for the wealthy.

(This information furnished by Joe E Baessler.)

Argument in Opposition

Here's What Will Happen Under Measure 90

We've seen from California and Washington what happens under a Top Two elections system. Many voters in the General Election will be **forced to choose between two candidates from the same party**—all other voices will be shut out of the election, and voters who don't affiliate with that one party will have no other options.

Because of the Top Two primary in Washington State, voters in the 4th Congressional District will be forced to choose between the following two candidates:

- Conservative Republican Clint Didier, who is anti-choice, opposes gun laws, wants to repeal Obamacare, and parrots the right-wing position on immigration, and
- Conservative Republican Dan Newhouse, who is anti-choice, opposes gun laws, wants to repeal Obamacare,

and parrots the right-wing position on immigration

Voters who don't identify with these two candidates and their very similar agendas will have no other alternatives on the ballot. This is a district where **more than 78,000 people voted for a Democratic candidate in 2012** against an entrenched incumbent.

And yet, under the Top Two elections system, these voters won't see anyone on the ballot who even remotely represents them. They can choose between someone they fundamentally disagree with, and someone they fundamentally disagree with. Or, more likely, they'll simply choose not to vote in that race.

This is just one example. The same pattern has been repeated in numerous races. Reducing voter choice to just one major party is not the kind of "reform" that will improve our democracy.

It comes down to this: Does our democracy work best when the largest number of voters have lots of meaningful choices? Or do we want a system where voters are forced to pick between two candidates who don't represent them?

For me, the choice is clear. I'm voting no on Measure 90.

Carl Wolfson
Radio Host, Carl in the Morning

(This information furnished by Meghan W. Moyer, Campaign Manager/Protect Our Vote Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Who's Supporting Measure 90? Oregon's Biggest Corporate Interests.

Measure 90 is opposed by organizations representing hundreds of thousands of Oregonians from every walk of life. The members of this broad coalition oppose the measure because they believe that all voters should have meaningful choices on the fall ballot.

In the words of the Citizens Initiative Review panel—which **voted 14-5 to oppose Measure 90**: "M90 limits the voice of minority voters, minor parties, and grassroots campaigns. A diverse electorate needs choice & diversity in the General Election." (<http://healthydemocracy.org/citizens-initiative-review/oregon/measure-90-final/>)

So who's supporting it? **The biggest corporate interests in the state** are enthusiastically behind Measure 90.

Here's a partial look at who's funding the campaign, as of August:

Associated Oregon Industries: \$50,000
A-DEC Dental: \$50,000
The Pape Group: \$50,000
Tim Boyle (Columbia Sportswear): \$25,000
Cambia Health Solutions (formerly Regence): \$25,000
Roseburg Forest Products: \$25,000
The Standard: \$25,000
Oregon Business Association: \$20,000
PGE: \$10,000
PacifiCorp: \$10,000

(Source: ORESTAR)

Why are they putting so much money into an idea that Oregonians have already rejected?

Because they want to make it easier to elect politicians who will side with their narrow corporate agenda at the expense of working families.

Measure 90 would silence grassroots campaigns, shutting minor parties and independent candidates out of the fall election.

Our elections shouldn't just be for the wealthy few. All Oregon voters should be able to vote their values when it matters most.

To find out more and to join the coalition, go to:

www.NoOnMeasure90.org

(This information furnished by Scott Moore, Protect Our Vote.)

Argument in Opposition

I'm an independent voter, and I oppose Measure 90.

Oregon's elections system may not be perfect, but one thing it does really well is provide multiple choices in the General Election.

Currently, the ballot features a variety of voices, and Oregon has a long and proud history of minor parties and nonaffiliated candidates. No matter what your political beliefs—left, right, and everywhere in between—you can find a voice on the ballot that represents you.

I'm an independent voter because I don't necessarily want to tie myself down to any one party. I like to consider all of my options and then vote my principles.

Under Measure 90, all of those many choices will disappear.

Minor parties will no longer even appear on the fall ballot. Independent candidates won't be able to run grassroots signature campaigns to get on the ballot.

Despite the fact that a growing number of voters don't identify with the Democratic or Republican parties, Measure 90 would ensure that the only choices available to voters in the general election—the one election that matters the most—will be just two major party candidates.

In many races, the two candidates would be from just one party.

And if you don't identify with that one party, you will have no other choices—other than to not vote.

Independent voters like me—and all Oregon voters—should be able to choose from many parties on the ballot, not just two major party candidates. This measure isn't fair to independent voters and minor parties because they will almost never appear on the general election ballot.

This measure is being funded by big corporate lobbyists and CEOs in order to block grassroots campaigns and make it easier to advance their own interests, not to help independent voters.

To preserve real choices on the ballot when it matters most, I'm voting no.

C. John Larson
Hermiston

(This information furnished by Meghan Moyer, Protect Our Vote Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Democrats are Voting No on 90

Measure 90 will limit choices and open our elections up to manipulation.

Top-two primary systems encourage mischief. Like Rush Limbaugh's "Operation Chaos" in 2008, Republicans can organize to vote for the weakest Democratic candidate or find other ways to game the system.

That's what we've seen in California (they call it a "jungle primary" there), where because of the top-two primary, voters in a Democratic majority congressional district were only given the choice between two Republican candidates for Congress in the general election. No wonder California's

primary in 2014 had the lowest turnout in history—only 23.7%!

In fact, due to the top-two primary system voters in 19 California races and 10 Washington legislative races will only be able to choose between two candidates from the same party on the 2014 general election ballot. That's just wrong.

Because the voters in a Primary Election are much different than voters in a General Election, we could even see single-party races in districts that could otherwise have been competitive between multiple parties.

Measure 90 will replace our primary system with a closed General Election that could double the cost of elections, increase the influence of big money, and reduce voter participation.

And furthermore, this poorly written, complicated initiative has many unintended consequences. It would allow Republican county commissioners to fill a legislative vacancy in a seat held by a Democrat—with a Republican.

Oregon voters already rejected this same proposal in 2008 by a vote of 66%-34%. It was a bad idea then, and it's a bad idea now.

Real reform means increasing choice and participation for everyone, not limiting choices in the biggest, most important elections.

It's time once again to reject this bad idea. **Vote No on Measure 90.**

Frank Dixon
State Party Chair
Democratic Party of Oregon

(This information furnished by Frank Dixon, State Chair, Democratic Party of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Don't Let Corporate Special Interests Block Grassroots Campaigns

The 42,000 teachers, support staff and college faculty of the Oregon Education Association ask for your NO Vote on Measure 90. Stop special interests from taking over our elections!

Another Bad Idea From The Corporate Lobby

If this measure sounds familiar, it's because Oregon voters have already rejected it. In 2008, this same measure was overwhelmingly defeated. This bad idea has failed in California and Washington.

So why is it back? A very small group of millionaires, corporate CEOs, and lobbyists for big business wrote and are funding this measure because they want a system that elects even more politicians who support their narrow corporate agenda at the expense of working families.

These same people have blocked efforts to have corporations pay their fair share to fund our schools.

Measure 90 Would Silence Grassroots Campaigns

Under Measure 90, only the two most well-funded candidates would ever appear on the General Election ballot. Minor parties, independent candidates, and grassroots campaigns would be shut out of the "top two" and left off the ballot. The only choices available to voters would be the two major party candidates with access to the deepest pockets.

Corporate special interests don't want grassroots campaigns getting in the way of their agenda of big tax breaks for corporations and millionaires, and fewer protections for working people. But rather than have an honest debate, they're attempting to stack the deck in their favor by completely rewriting the rules.

Measure 90 Would Limit Voter Participation

Top Two elections have failed to increase voter turnout anywhere they've been tried. Instead, this "corporate-sponsored" election scheme results in General Election races with two candidates on the ballot from a single major party – leaving out any political choice. The result is fewer options, with more and more voters choosing to not participate at all.

Educators Across Oregon Say Vote NO on Measure 90

Hanna Vaandering
Oregon Education Association President

(This information furnished by Hanna Vaandering, President, Oregon Education Association.)

Argument in Opposition

The Members of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 555 are Voting NO on Measure 90

Let's Protect the Voice of All Oregon Voters

Measure 90 would eliminate our current election system and replace it with a closed General Election that limits voter participation. If this measure were to pass, voters in November elections would only ever be able to choose between two candidates, both from the major political parties. Minor parties and nonaffiliated voters would be shut out of the election.

Given the state of our nation's politics today, we think it's a terrible idea to create a system that further limits the choices available to voters. Improving our democracy will require more grassroots activism and more participation among all voters. This measure would put an end to grassroots campaigning.

It would also give more power to Primary Election voters, who tend to be older, wealthier, more partisan, and less diverse than General Election voters. We need to empower young people, new voters, and low-income families, but this measure only limits their voices.

This measure was brought to the ballot by a small handful of millionaires, corporate CEOs, and business lobbying groups who want to elect more politicians who side with their narrow corporate agenda over the needs of working people.

California and Washington have adopted nearly identical measures, and they've failed to deliver on any of their backers' promises. Minor parties have disappeared from the ballot, voters have fewer choices, turnout has fallen, and political operatives have engaged in dishonest tactics in order to undermine the will of voters.

Our political system may not be perfect and there are many things we can do to improve our elections. But silencing voices and taking away choices from most voters will only make matters worse.

Please join us in voting NO on Measure 90.

Jeff Anderson, Secretary Treasurer
UFCW Local 555

(This information furnished by Jeff Anderson, Secretary Treasurer, UFCW Local 555.)

Argument in Opposition

Republicans and Democrats Agree that Measure 90 Eliminates Real Choices for All Voters

We're bridging the aisle to say that no matter where you fit on the political spectrum, **Measure 90 would take away your meaningful choices in the General Election.**

This measure could result in placing two candidates from the same party on the ballot in the general election, so voters

would be forced to choose between two candidates from the same party—even in otherwise competitive districts.

If you don't affiliate with that one party, you won't have anyone on the ballot to choose from. Having to choose between two candidates from the same party and with similar platforms will dramatically limit the diversity of opinions and positions in the election.

Voter Turnout Has Fallen in "Top Two" States

Despite the claims of Measure 90's backers, participation hasn't increased anywhere this idea has been tried. Primary voter turnout continues to fall. In fact, California just set a record for **lowest turnout in state history** after passing a similar measure.

Measure 90 is Filled with Flaws

Measure 90 is filled with many negative consequences, both intended and unintended:

- County commissioners would get to fill legislative vacancies, without any regard to the departing legislator's party affiliation or the will of the voters. That means a Republican commission could fill a Democrat's seat with a Republican, and vice versa.
- Some counties would have their own elections rules, creating a confusing patchwork of elections. Many legislators would have to run different kinds of campaigns in different parts of their district.
- If a candidate gets more than 50% in the primary, depending on the office, there may not even be a general election race at all.

Frank Dixon, State Chair
Democratic Party of Oregon

Bill Currier, Vice Chair
Oregon Republican Party

Brad Martin,
Executive Director
Democratic Party of Oregon

Greg Leo, Former
Executive Director
Oregon Republican Party

(This information furnished by Frank Dixon, State Chair, Democratic Party of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Firefighters Urge a NO Vote on Measure 90

All voters deserve real choices on the ballot when it matters most.

Oregon's firefighters show up to work every day dedicated to protecting all Oregonians—young, old, rich, poor, conservative, liberal, and everyone else in between. We work to serve all Oregonians, not just the privileged few.

We believe our democracy works best when voters have meaningful choices when it matters most. We trust Oregon voters to make good decisions from among a variety of political voices.

Measure 90, however, would take away many of the choices available to the 80+ percent of the voters who participate in the General Election. Under this measure, voters in the fall would be forced to choose between just two candidates, almost always from the two major political parties.

Oregon voters should be able to choose from many parties on the ballot, not just the two well-funded major party candidates who have enough campaign cash to make it through a May primary. This measure is not fair for independent voters, minor parties, or grassroots campaigns, because they will almost never appear on the General Election ballot.

In many cases, voters would have to choose between two candidates from the same party, as we've seen in high-profile races in California and Washington. Voters who don't identify with that one party—and only one party—would have no other options available to them. In other states where this has

happened, it's led to fewer people voting in those races.

There are many things we should be doing to improve our elections system and to ensure that our elected leaders are representing all Oregonians.

However, any ballot measure that decreases voter choices, lowers participation, and silences grassroots voices would be a big step in the wrong direction.

Join Oregon Firefighters in saying NO to Measure 90.

Oregon State Firefighters Council

(This information furnished by Kelly Bach, President, Oregon State Firefighters Council.)

Argument in Opposition

Just the Facts About Measure 90

In August, after reviewing and debating all of the facts, the panelists of the **Citizens Initiative Review Commission voted 14-5 to OPPOSE Measure 90.**

Despite the flood of campaign cash that will come from the special interests backing Measure 90, the Protect Our Vote Coalition believes that when voters have access to the same facts that the Citizens Initiative Review panelists had, they'll see through the political spin.

FACT: Measure 90 was put on the ballot by large corporate interests. It's supported by Associated Oregon Industries, other business groups & CEOs. Their measure would silence grassroots voices and elect politicians who side with their narrow corporate agenda.

FACT: Nearly all the money to fund the Yes campaign for M90 has come from large corporate donations and wealthy CEOs.

FACT: Measure 90 will not increase voter turnout. In California and Washington, which have similar laws, turnout has only fallen. California just set a record for lowest turnout in state history.

FACT: Measure 90 will keep minor parties and nonaffiliated candidates from appearing on the November ballot. In other states, minor parties are disappearing entirely.

FACT: Oregonians age 18-39 make up 38% of the adult population, but cast only 13% of the votes in the 2012 primary. Conversely, Oregonians age 60 and over accounted for 27% of Oregon's adult population, but made up 58% of the voters in the 2012 primary election. Under the Top Two, these voters would have even more influence over the political system.

FACT: In California and Washington, around 25% of the November races are now between candidates from just one major political party with similar platforms. Voters have no other choices.

FACT: In the case of a legislative vacancy, Measure 90 gives county commissioners the ability to replace the legislator without any regard to party affiliation.

To find out more and to add your voice to the coalition, visit:

www.NoOnMeasure90.org

(This information furnished by Kate Gonsalves, Protect Our Vote.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Right to Life urges you to vote NO on Ballot Measure 90!

Measure 90 would eliminate primary nomination elections. This would greatly weaken the ability of voters to express their values. Citizens support candidates representing a

political party in primary elections because the citizens share the values of that party. This measure would deprive like-minded voters the ability to nominate a single candidate to represent them in the General Election. This is not only true for members of the two major political parties, but also for voters affiliated with other organizations like the Independent Party as well.

As a result, eliminating primaries will make it more likely that special interest groups from out of state will be able to use their money to crowd out the voice of regular Oregonians.

In every other state that has eliminated party primary elections, grassroots organizations have been marginalized and the values of regular people have suffered. Oregon Right to Life's members come from all walks of life, and our current primary election system ensures that all voters have the equal ability to come together and choose candidates who share their values. If Measure 90 is passed, this will no longer be the case.

Please vote NO on measure 90 and protect your ability to express your values.

(This information furnished by Gayle A Atteberry, Executive Director, Oregon Right To Life.)

Argument in Opposition

Vote No on Measure 90: Let's Keep 650,000 Independent Voters out of OUR Elections

We, the established political party elite
Have wondered why Oregonians have voted with their feet
And quit our parties at lighting speed
Just the join the ranks of the "Independent" creed

We've done our best to keep them out
And keep closed elections safely under our clout

Now there's Measure 90, which threatens our lock
On primary elections where our hand-picked partisans vote
en bloc

Our power is threatened and we are scrambling to explain
Why Measure 90 should take the blame

Over 650,000 Oregonians say they want to vote
But "Big, Scary Corporations like Measure 90!" is all we wrote
To prevent a disaster for our partisan extremes
Who own Oregon elections today, thanks to our plentiful means
650,000 independent voters have the audacity to want their say,
But over and over, we say "No Way!"

(Elections, after all, are OUR sandbox, and we'd like to keep it that way.)

So Vote NO on Measure 90
And keep the independent riffraff out
Continue to trust partisan extremists like us, without a doubt
Keep the independent thinkers out of OUR elections in OUR Oregon. Visit www.voteno90.com

(This information furnished by Maurice A. Henderson II, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 90.)

Argument in Opposition

No!

California recently changed its election system, making it very similar to what this measure would do in Oregon. We should learn from our neighbor's mistake, not jump off the bridge along with them!

A single-ballot ("blanket") primary makes the primary election more important, but it will not increase turnout. California's primary turnout was 33% in 2012 (before adopting a blanket primary) and then fell to 31% in 2012, and fell again to just 25% in 2014. The blanket primary has *reduced* turnout in California! Turnout in Oregon's 2012 primary was less than

40%, but over 80% in the general election. Are you sure you want to *increase* the importance of a *low-turnout* election?

Having only the top two candidates advance to the general election will entrench the two major parties *forever*. If you love Republicans and Democrats, fine, but if you aren't satisfied with the government you have and wish someone different would be elected someday, this measure would destroy any chance of that happening.

Minor party candidates who promise genuine change – and whose mere presence in the general election is a powerful influence on the major party candidates – would be wiped off of the general election ballot in all but the most lopsided districts.

The "top two" feature also causes clearly wrong outcomes. In 2012, in California's 31st Congressional District, where Democrats enjoyed a 15% voter registration advantage, *two Republican* candidates and *no Democrats* advanced to the general election. How? Because the primary had *four* Democrat candidates who split the vote. A Republican was elected in a +15% Democrat district!

This measure takes the power to nominate away from political parties, making it impossible for them to prevent vote-splitting at the primary, and simultaneously creating a perverse incentive for other parties to run "clone" or "ringer" candidates to split the vote. If you thought politics was dirty now, this measure would make it much worse.

Don't repeat California's mistake in Oregon!

(This information furnished by Kyle Markley.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon's Grassroots Political Parties Say "Vote NO" on Measure 90: the "Top Two Primary"

The big business backers of Measure 90 want to restrict your right to vote for the candidates and political parties of your choice. They want only Democrats and Republicans on the November ballot.

Measure 90 will allow only two candidates on the November ballot in each race. Both candidates can be from the same party.

Under "Top Two" in Washington and California, there have been:

ZERO minor party or independent candidates on the general election ballot for any statewide office

and

ZERO minor party candidates for any office, including the Legislature, when two major party candidates ran in the primary election.

Washington elects 147 legislators and 12 Congress members; California elects 120 legislators and 55 Congress members. In November, voters in those states could vote for only Democrats and Republicans in races where at least 2 of them ran in the primary. In California there will be 28 races this November between 2 Democrats or between 2 Republicans.

In practice, "Top Two" means just Democrats and Republicans, period.

The impartial Oregon Citizens' Review Committee voted 14-5 to oppose Measure 90, in part because:

"Measure 90 has several drafting errors. The most significant appears to eliminate minor parties. Because M90 bars parties from nominating candidates, their legal status is in jeopardy."

Measure 90 backers claim it will increase voter turnout and produce "moderate" legislatures. But, under Top Two, California and Washington just suffered the lowest voter turnout primaries in their histories. A 2014 study by professors at Princeton and Georgetown ranked the California

and Washington legislatures #1 and #4 in most polarization among the 50 states. Oregon ranked #18.

Oregon has a long and proud history of grassroots political parties and independent voices. Voters need real, meaningful choices on the November ballot. That's why we're urging NO on Measure 90.

VISIT SAVEOREGONSDEMOCRACY.ORG

Oregon Progressive Party progparty.org
Pacific Green Party of Oregon pacificgreens.org

(This information furnished by David Hess, Treasurer, Progressive Party.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 90 Limits Choice & Voice for Communities of Color

One in 5 Oregonians are from a community of color and yet have been historically underrepresented in our political process. There are many things we can and should do to improve representation in our politics, but **Measure 90 would be a major step backward.**

Measure 90 would limit General Election choices and increase the cost of campaigns--this would create barriers for our communities to engage in Oregon's Democracy.

This would mean that a very small group of Primary Election voters can close the General Election to the entire electorate, which really impacts voters from communities of color. Locking out smaller parties and the potential for some races to be between two candidates from the same party would mean that General Election voters may not have the ability to vote for candidates who really represent them.

While communities of color are rapidly becoming more engaged as voters, there is a still a significant gap. This is worse in the Primary Election where the voting electorate is even less diverse. Measure 90 won't fix this problem--it would only magnify the gap between Primary Election voters and the general public.

We also urge voting No on Measure 90 because it increases the chance that big money special interests will have more power to influence who advances to the Top 2 General Election. Furthermore, candidates may have to raise even more cash to win. These are real challenges for emerging communities to be able to get engaged.

As shown in other states, Measure 90 takes away meaningful choice from all voters in the General Election.

For those of us dedicated to making sure that our democratic system better represents all of Oregon, Measure 90 is a big step in the wrong direction. Please Vote No on 90.

**Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
PCUN (Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste)**

(This information furnished by Jaime Arredondo, PCUN.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 90 is Deeply Flawed and Poorly Written

This poorly drafted, sweeping measure contains a host of ambiguities and consequences, many of which may have been unintended by the drafters. Here are a few of them:

- **There may not be a General Election at all if a candidate receives more than 50% of the vote in the Primary.** The measure incorporates "all provisions of state law that apply to the filing and nomination process for candidates for nonpartisan offices." In nonpartisan state races, if a candidate gets more than 50% in a Primary, they automatically win the seat.

- **In the case of a legislative vacancy, county commissioners would have the power to appoint a replacement, regardless of the legislator's political party affiliation.** That means a Democratic-controlled county commission could appoint a Democrat to replace a Republican, and vice versa.
- **The measure appears to eliminate write-ins.** Because the measure only allows the "Top Two" candidates to advance to the fall election, write-in candidates would not be allowed.
- **Some counties can make their own rules, independent of the statewide system.** We could end up with 10 different elections systems throughout the state, creating a confusing and unworkable patchwork of election laws. In fact, because many districts cross county lines, they could be forced to run different kinds of campaigns in different parts of their district.
- **Measure 90 may eliminate parties entirely.** Because minor parties will no longer be able to nominate candidates to the General Election, they will most likely not be able to retain their party status.

Our election system can be improved, but Measure 90's menu of flaws are too serious to be ignored.

To protect our vote in our elections, we recommend voters reject Measure 90.

Steven C. Berman, Stoll Berne **Margaret S. Olney, Bennett
Hartman Morris & Kaplan LLP**

Harry B. Wilson, attorney **Jennifer Williamson,
attorney**

Christine B. Mason, attorney

(This information furnished by Christine B. Mason.)

Argument in Opposition

WHY DO UNION MEMBERS OPPOSE THE TOP TWO PRIMARY?

**LESS POWER FOR VOTERS
NO THIRD PARTY CANDIDATES
DECREASED VOTER TURNOUT
MORE MONEY IN ELECTIONS**

Measure 90 would force voters in the General Election to choose between just two candidates, almost always from the two major parties. In many parts of the state, voters would be forced to choose between candidates from just one party.

Minor parties and independent candidates would be shut out of the fall election.

And those with the time and money to do so would have more opportunities to game the system.

A Top Two system won't increase turnout

Too few Oregonians vote. But in states with a Top Two system, voter turnout hasn't increased – in fact, in some states fewer people are voting. We want to see more people involved. Top Two isn't the right fix.

Top Two moves the real choice to the primary

Already fewer people vote in the primary election, and those who do vote are regular voters who have been voting for years. Top Two doesn't increase turnout, and it moves the real choice to the election where fewer people vote.

Minor Parties won't be on the November ballot

In states with Top Two primaries, third party candidates don't make it to the November ballot – when more people are voting. That means most voters have less choice, and minor party candidates have a harder time building support.

More expensive elections

What states with Top Two primaries have found is that elections cost more.

Fewer voters when the decisions are really made? Lower voter turnout? More money in our elections?

JOIN THE MEMBERS OF THE OREGON AFL-CIO IN SAYING NO

**Tom Chamberlain, President
Oregon AFL-CIO**

*(This information furnished by Tom Chamberlain, President,
Oregon AFL-CIO.)*

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

91

Allows possession, manufacture, sale of marijuana by/to adults, subject to state licensing, regulation, taxation

Estimate of Financial Impact	96
Text of Measure	96
Explanatory Statement	110
Arguments in Favor	111
Arguments in Opposition	119

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote allows possession, authorizes in-state manufacture, processing, sale of marijuana by/to adults; licensing, regulation, taxation by state; retains current medical marijuana laws.

Result of “No” Vote:

“No” vote retains laws classifying cannabis as a controlled substance; prohibiting most sale, possession, manufacture of cannabis; permitting production, possession of cannabis for medical use.

Summary

Currently, cultivation, possession, delivery, sale of marijuana are unlawful, excepting regulated production, possession, use of medical marijuana. Measure allows production, processing, delivery, possession, sale of marijuana to adults, licensed, regulated by Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC). Marijuana producer, processor, wholesaler may deliver “marijuana items” (defined) only to/on licensed retail premises. OLCC collects tax imposed on marijuana producer at different rates for marijuana flowers, leaves, immature plant. “Homegrown marijuana” (defined) not regulated, taxed. Tax revenues, fees fund OLCC suspense account, Oregon Marijuana Account distributed: 40% to Common School Fund; 20% for mental health/alcohol/drug services; 15% for state police; 20% for local law enforcement; 5% to Oregon Health Authority. “Marijuana paraphernalia” (defined) excluded from “drug paraphernalia” laws. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

This measure legalizes, regulates and taxes the manufacture, sale and use of marijuana in Oregon. State and local expenditures and revenues will be impacted by passage of this measure.

The measure requires the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) to license and regulate the distribution of marijuana. The revenue estimate from taxes when fully implemented may range from \$17 million to \$40 million annually.

The OLCC estimates that the start-up costs are about \$300,000 in state fiscal year 2015, about \$2.5 million in state fiscal year 2016, and \$1.0 million in 2017. OLCC annual operating expenses are estimated to be \$3.2 million per year. New revenues are expected to be sufficient to offset these costs.

The remaining revenue beyond expenses would be distributed as follows: 40% to the Common School Fund, 20% to the Mental Health Alcoholism and Drug Services Account, 15% to the State Police Account, 10% to cities for law enforcement, 10% to counties for law enforcement, and 5% to the Oregon Health Authority for alcohol and drug abuse prevention, early intervention and treatment services.

The Oregon Health Authority estimates \$200,000 per year in additional expenditures for two positions to license marijuana facilities that test marijuana products. This estimate assumes 20 such facilities. New revenues are expected to be sufficient to offset these costs.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture estimates \$100,000 per year in additional expenditures for one position to provide rulemaking related to marijuana-infused food products, engage in outreach to the food industry, and assist members of the food industry to achieve compliance with rules. New revenues are expected to be sufficient to offset these costs.

Oregon State Police estimates that passage of the initiative would create a need for three additional Highway Interdiction Team detectives as well as training of all sworn members in Advanced Roadside Impairment Driving Enforcement and training of some members to join the existing pool of Drug Recognition Experts. The associated start-up costs for additional staffing and training are estimated at \$400,000 in state fiscal year 2016 and ongoing expenses of \$400,000 per year beginning in fiscal year 2016. New revenues are expected to be sufficient to offset these costs.

The Oregon Judicial Department expects additional court costs to address OLCC rulemaking and licensing authority of between \$21,417 and \$55,902 in the 2015-17 biennium and between \$13,068 and \$47,190 per year in later biennia.

Passage of the initiative may result in the reduction in the number of persons entering the public safety system for marijuana-related violations, thereby reducing state General Fund expenditures on community corrections. Passage of the initiative may result in a reduction in the dollar value of fines collected by state and local governments for convictions of marijuana-related violations. Therefore, the impact for state and local governments, district attorneys, and the courts is indeterminate.

New jobs created will generate an indeterminate amount of income tax revenue.

Text of Measure

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

This Act shall be known as:

Control, Regulation, and Taxation of Marijuana and Industrial Hemp Act

SECTION 1. (1) The People of the State of Oregon declare that the purposes of this Act are:

(a) To eliminate the problems caused by the prohibition and uncontrolled manufacture, delivery, and possession of marijuana within this state;

(b) To protect the safety, welfare, health, and peace of the people of this state by prioritizing the state's limited law enforcement resources in the most effective, consistent, and rational way;

(c) To permit persons licensed, controlled, regulated, and taxed by this state to legally manufacture and sell marijuana to persons 21 years of age and older, subject to the provisions of this Act;

(d) To ensure that the State Department of Agriculture issues industrial hemp licenses and agricultural hemp seed production permits in accordance with existing state law; and

(e) To establish a comprehensive regulatory framework concerning marijuana under existing state law.

(2) The People of the State of Oregon intend that the provisions of this Act, together with the other provisions of existing state law, will:

(a) Prevent the distribution of marijuana to persons under 21 years of age;

(b) Prevent revenue from the sale of marijuana from going to criminal enterprises, gangs, and cartels;

(c) Prevent the diversion of marijuana from this state to other states;

(d) Prevent marijuana activity that is legal under state law from being used as a cover or pretext for the trafficking of other illegal drugs or other illegal activity;

(e) Prevent violence and the use of firearms in the cultivation and distribution of marijuana;

(f) Prevent drugged driving and the exacerbation of other adverse public health consequences associated with the use of marijuana;

(g) Prevent the growing of marijuana on public lands and the attendant public safety and environmental dangers posed by marijuana production on public lands; and

(h) Prevent the possession and use of marijuana on federal property.

SECTION 2. (1) Sections 3 to 70 of this Act are added to and made a part of the Oregon Revised Statutes.

(2) Section 71 is added to and made a part of ORS chapter 317.

(3) Section 72 is added to and made a part of ORS chapter 475.

(4) Section 73 is added to and made a part of ORS chapter 811.

(General)

SECTION 3. Short title. Sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall be known and may be cited as the Control, Regulation, and Taxation of Marijuana and Industrial Hemp Act.

SECTION 4. Limitations. Sections 3 to 70 of this Act may not be construed:

- (1) To amend or affect in any way any state or federal law pertaining to employment matters;
- (2) To amend or affect in any way any state or federal law pertaining to landlord-tenant matters;
- (3) To prohibit a recipient of a federal grant or an applicant for a federal grant from prohibiting the manufacture, delivery, possession, or use of marijuana to the extent necessary to satisfy federal requirements for the grant;
- (4) To prohibit a party to a federal contract or a person applying to be a party to a federal contract from prohibiting the manufacture, delivery, possession, or use of marijuana to the extent necessary to comply with the terms and conditions of the contract or to satisfy federal requirements for the contract;
- (5) To require a person to violate a federal law;
- (6) To exempt a person from a federal law or obstruct the enforcement of a federal law; or
- (7) To amend or affect in any way the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act.

SECTION 5. Definitions. As used in sections 3 to 70 of this Act:

- (1) "Authority" means the Oregon Health Authority.
- (2) "Commission" means the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.
- (3) "Consumer" means a person who purchases, acquires, owns, holds, or uses marijuana items other than for the purpose of resale.
- (4) "Department" means the State Department of Agriculture.
- (5)(a) "Financial consideration," except as provided in paragraph (b) of this subsection, means value that is given or received directly or indirectly through sales, barter, trade, fees, charges, dues, contributions or donations.
- (b) "Financial consideration" does not mean any of the following:
- (A) Homegrown marijuana made by another person.
- (B) Homemade marijuana products made by another person.
- (6) "Homegrown" or "homemade" means grown or made by a person 21 years of age or older for noncommercial purposes.
- (7) "Household" means a housing unit, and includes any place in or around the housing unit at which the occupants of the housing unit are producing, processing, keeping, or storing homegrown marijuana or homemade marijuana products.
- (8) "Housing unit" means a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied as separate living quarters, in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall.
- (9) "Immature marijuana plant" means a marijuana plant with no observable flowers or buds.
- (10) "Licensee" means any person holding a license issued under this Act, or any person holding a license or permit issued under any regulation promulgated under paragraph (e) of subsection (2) of section 7 of this Act.
- (11) "Licensee representative" means an owner, director, officer, manager, employee, agent, or other representative of a licensee, to the extent such person acts in such representative capacity.
- (12)(a) "Marijuana" means all parts of the plant Cannabis family Moraceae, whether growing or not, other than marijuana extracts.
- (b) "Marijuana" does not include industrial hemp, as defined in ORS 571.300, or industrial hemp commodities or products.
- (13) "Marijuana extract" means a product obtained by separating resins from marijuana by solvent extraction, using solvents other than vegetable glycerin, such as butane, hexane, isopropyl alcohol, ethanol, and carbon dioxide.
- (14)(a) "Marijuana flowers" means the flowers of the plant Cannabis family Moraceae.
- (b) "Marijuana flowers" does not include any part of the plant other than the flowers.
- (15) "Marijuana items" means marijuana, marijuana products, and marijuana extracts.
- (16)(a) "Marijuana leaves" means the leaves of the plant Cannabis family Moraceae.
- (b) "Marijuana leaves" does not include any part of the plant other than the leaves.
- (17) "Marijuana processor" means a person who processes marijuana items in this state.
- (18) "Marijuana producer" means a person who produces marijuana in this state.
- (19)(a) "Marijuana products" means products that contain marijuana or marijuana extracts and are intended for human consumption.
- (b) "Marijuana products" does not mean:
- (A) Marijuana, by itself; or
- (B) A marijuana extract, by itself.
- (20) "Marijuana retailer" means a person who sells marijuana items to a consumer in this state.
- (21) "Marijuana wholesaler" means a person who purchases marijuana items in this state for resale to a person other than a consumer in this state.
- (22) "Mature marijuana plant" means any marijuana plant that is not an immature marijuana plant.
- (23) "Noncommercial" means not dependent or conditioned upon the provision or receipt of financial consideration.
- (24) "Person" means any natural person, corporation, professional corporation, nonprofit corporation, cooperative corporation, profit or nonprofit unincorporated association, business trust, limited liability company, general or limited partnership, joint venture, or any other legal entity.
- (25) "Premises" or "licensed premises" means a location licensed under sections 3 to 70 of this Act and includes:
- (a) All enclosed areas at the location that are used in the business operated at the location, including offices, kitchens, rest rooms and storerooms, including all public and private areas;
- (b) All areas outside of a building that the Oregon Liquor Control Commission has specifically licensed for the production, processing, wholesale sale, or retail sale of marijuana items; and
- (c) For a location that the commission has specifically licensed for the production of marijuana outside of a building, the entire lot or parcel, as defined in ORS 92.010, that the licensee owns, leases, or has a right to occupy.

(26)(a) “Processes” means:

(A) The processing, compounding, or conversion of marijuana into marijuana products or marijuana extracts;

(B) The processing, compounding, or conversion of marijuana, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of natural origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis;

(C) The packaging or repackaging of marijuana items; or

(D) The labeling or relabeling of any package or container of marijuana items.

(b) “Processes” does not include:

(A) The drying of marijuana by a marijuana producer, if the marijuana producer is not otherwise processing marijuana; or

(B) The packaging and labeling of marijuana by a marijuana producer in preparation for delivery to a marijuana processor.

(27)(a) “Produces” means the manufacture, planting, cultivation, growing, or harvesting of marijuana.

(b) “Produces” does not include:

(A) The drying of marijuana by a marijuana processor, if the marijuana processor is not otherwise producing marijuana; or

(B) The cultivation and growing of an immature marijuana plant by a marijuana processor, marijuana wholesaler, or marijuana retailer if the marijuana processor, marijuana wholesaler, or marijuana retailer purchased or otherwise received the plant from a licensed marijuana producer.

(28) “Public place” means a place to which the general public has access and includes, but is not limited to, hallways, lobbies and other parts of apartment houses and hotels not constituting rooms or apartments designed for actual residence, and highways, streets, schools, places of amusement, parks, playgrounds and premises used in connection with public passenger transportation.

(29) “Usable marijuana” means dried marijuana flowers and dried marijuana leaves, and any mixture or preparation thereof.

SECTION 6. Exemptions. (1) Sections 7 to 44 and 60 to 62 of this Act do not apply:

(a) To the production, processing, keeping, or storage of homegrown marijuana at a household by one or more persons 21 years of age and older if the total of homegrown marijuana at the household does not exceed four marijuana plants and eight ounces of usable marijuana at a given time.

(b) To the making, processing, keeping, or storage of homemade marijuana products at a household by one or more persons 21 years of age and older if the total of homemade marijuana products at the household does not exceed sixteen ounces in solid form at a given time.

(c) To the making, processing, keeping, or storage of homemade marijuana products at a household by one or more persons 21 years of age and older if the total of homemade marijuana products at the household does not exceed seventy-two ounces in liquid form at a given time.

(d) To the delivery of not more than one ounce of homegrown marijuana at a given time by a person 21 years of age or older to another person 21 years of age or older for noncommercial purposes.

(e) To the delivery of not more than sixteen ounces of homemade marijuana products in solid form at a given time by a person 21 years of age or older to another person 21 years of age or older for noncommercial purposes.

(f) To the delivery of not more than seventy-two ounces of homemade marijuana products in liquid form at a given time by a person 21 years of age or older to another person 21 years of age or older for noncommercial purposes.

(2) Sections 7 to 70 of this Act:

(a) Do not apply to the extent a person acts within the scope of and in compliance with the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act; or

(b) Do not amend or affect in any way the function, duties, and powers of the Oregon Health Authority under the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act.

SECTION 7. Powers and duties of Oregon Liquor Control Commission. (1) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission has the powers and duties specified in sections 3 to 70 of this Act, and also the powers necessary or proper to enable it to carry out fully and effectually all the purposes of sections 3 to 70 of this Act. The jurisdiction, supervision, powers and duties of the commission extend to any person who buys, sells, produces, processes, transports, or delivers any marijuana items within this state. The commission may sue and be sued.

(2) The function, duties, and powers of the commission in sections 3 to 70 of this Act include the following:

(a) To regulate the purchase, sale, production, processing, transportation, and delivery of marijuana items in accordance with the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

(b) To grant, refuse, suspend or cancel licenses for the sale, processing, or production of marijuana items, or other licenses in regard to marijuana items, and to permit, in its discretion, the transfer of a license of any person.

(c) To collect the taxes and duties imposed by sections 3 to 70 of this Act, and to issue, and provide for cancellation, stamps and other devices as evidence of payment of such taxes or duties.

(d) To investigate and aid in the prosecution of every violation of Oregon statutes relating to marijuana items, and cooperate in the prosecution of offenders before any state court of competent jurisdiction.

(e) To adopt such regulations as are necessary and feasible for carrying out the intent and provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act and to amend or repeal such regulations. When such regulations are adopted they shall have the full force and effect of law.

(f) To exercise all powers incidental, convenient or necessary to enable it to administer or carry out any of the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

(g) To regulate and prohibit any advertising by manufacturers, processors, wholesalers or retailers of marijuana items by the medium of newspapers, letters, billboards, radio or otherwise.

(h) To regulate the use of marijuana items for scientific, pharmaceutical, manufacturing, mechanical, industrial and other purposes.

(3) On or before January 1, 2016, the commission, after consultation with the State Department of Agriculture and the Oregon Health Authority, shall prescribe forms and adopt such rules and regulations as the commission deems necessary for the implementation and administration of sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

(4) On or before January 1, 2017, the commission shall:

(a) Examine available research, and may conduct or commission new research, to investigate the influence of marijuana on the ability of a person to drive a vehicle and on the concentration of delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol in a person’s blood, in each case taking into account all relevant factors; and

(b) Present the results of the research to the Legislative Assembly and make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly regarding whether any amendments to the Oregon Vehicle Code are appropriate.

(5) The commission has no power to purchase, own, sell, or possess any marijuana items.

SECTION 8. Powers and duties of State Department of Agriculture. The State Department of Agriculture shall assist and cooperate with the Oregon Liquor Control Commission and the Oregon Health Authority to the extent necessary for the commission and the authority to carry out the duties of the commission and the authority under sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

SECTION 9. Powers and duties of Oregon Health Authority. The Oregon Health Authority shall assist and cooperate with the Oregon Liquor Control Commission and the State Department of Agriculture to the extent necessary for the commission and the department to carry out the duties of the commission and the department under sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

SECTION 10. No liability for official acts. No member of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, the State Department of Agriculture, or the Oregon Health Authority may be sued for doing or omitting to do any act in the performance of duties as prescribed in sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

SECTION 11. Powers; licenses; federal law. (1) Neither the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, the State Department of Agriculture, nor the Oregon Health Authority may refuse to perform any duty under sections 3 to 70 of this Act on the basis that manufacturing, distributing, dispensing, possessing, or using marijuana is prohibited by federal law.

(2) The commission may not revoke or refuse to issue or renew a license under sections 3 to 70 of this Act on the basis that manufacturing, distributing, dispensing, possessing, or using marijuana is prohibited by federal law.

SECTION 12. Contracts. No contract shall be unenforceable on the basis that manufacturing, distributing, dispensing, possessing, or using marijuana is prohibited by federal law.

SECTION 13. Licensees and licensee representatives. Licensees and licensee representatives may produce, deliver, and possess marijuana items subject to the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act. The production, delivery, and possession of marijuana items by a licensee or a licensee representative in compliance with sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall not constitute a criminal or civil offense under Oregon law.

(Purchaser's Qualifications and Identification)

SECTION 14. Purchaser's qualifications. No licensee or licensee representative may sell or deliver any marijuana items to any person under 21 years of age.

SECTION 15. Limitations on purchasing may be imposed. The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may limit the quantity of marijuana items purchased at any one time by a consumer so as effectually to prevent the resale of marijuana items.

SECTION 16. Requiring identification from certain purchasers. All licensees and licensee representatives, before selling or serving marijuana items to any person about whom there is any reasonable doubt of the person's having reached 21 years of age, shall require such person to produce one of the following pieces of identification:

(1) The person's passport.

(2) The person's motor vehicle operator's license, whether issued in this state or by any other state, so long as the license has a picture of the person.

(3) An identification card issued under ORS 807.400.

(4) A United States military identification card.

(5) Any other identification card issued by a state that bears a picture of the person, the name of the person, the person's date of birth and a physical description of the person.

SECTION 17. False statement of age; statement of age as defense. (1) No person shall produce any piece of identification that would falsely indicate the person's age.

(2) If a piece of identification is offered as evidence in any administrative or criminal prosecution of a licensee or licensee representative for sale or service of marijuana items to a person not having reached 21 years of age, the licensee or licensee representative shall be found to have committed no crime or other wrong unless it is demonstrated that a reasonable person would have determined that the identification exhibited was altered or did not accurately describe the person to whom the marijuana items were sold or served.

(Marijuana Licenses)

SECTION 18. Oregon Liquor Control Commission's licensing duties. (1) On or before January 4, 2016, the Oregon Liquor Control Commission shall begin receiving applications for the licensing of persons to produce, process, and sell marijuana within the state. Upon receipt of a license application, the commission shall not unreasonably delay the processing, approval, or rejection of the application or, if the application is approved, the issuance of the license.

(2) The licenses described in sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall be issued by the commission, subject to its regulations and restrictions and the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

(3) The commission may not license a premises that does not have defined boundaries. A licensed premises need not be enclosed by a wall, fence or other structure, but the commission may require that any licensed premises be enclosed as a condition of issuing or renewing a license. The commission may not license premises that are mobile.

SECTION 19. Production license. (1) The production of marijuana is subject to regulation by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

(2) A marijuana producer must have a production license issued by the commission for the premises at which the marijuana is produced.

SECTION 20. Processor license. (1) The processing of marijuana items is subject to regulation by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

(2) A marijuana processor must have a processor license issued by the commission for the premises at which marijuana items are processed.

SECTION 21. Wholesale license. (1) The wholesale sale of marijuana items is subject to regulation by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

(2) A marijuana wholesaler must have a wholesale license issued by the commission for the premises at which marijuana items are received, kept, stored, or delivered.

SECTION 22. Retail license. (1) The retail sale of marijuana items is subject to regulation by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

(2) A marijuana retailer must have a retail license issued by the commission for the premises at which marijuana items are sold.

SECTION 23. Examination of books and premises of licensees. (1) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission has the right after 72 hours' notice to the owner or the agent of the owner to make an examination of the books and may at any time make an examination of the premises of any person licensed under sections 3 to 70 of this Act, for the purpose of determining

compliance with sections 3 to 70 of this Act and the rules of the commission.

(2) The commission shall not require the books of any licensee to be maintained on the premises of the licensee.

SECTION 24. No “tied house” prohibitions. The same person may hold one or more production licenses, one or more processor licenses, one or more wholesale licenses, and one or more retail licenses.

(Licensing Procedures)

SECTION 25. Characteristics of license. (1) A license granted under sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall:

- (a) Be a purely personal privilege.
- (b) Be valid for the period stated in the license.
- (c) Be renewable in the manner provided in section 28 of this Act, except for a cause which would be grounds for refusal to issue such license under section 29 of this Act.
- (d) Be revocable or suspendible as provided in section 30 of this Act.
- (e) Be transferable from the premises for which the license was originally issued to another premises subject to the provisions of this Act, any rules of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission and any municipal ordinance or local regulation.
- (f) Cease upon the death of the licensee, except as provided in subsection (2) of this section.
- (g) Not constitute property.
- (h) Not be alienable.
- (i) Not be subject to attachment or execution.
- (j) Not descend by the laws of testate or intestate devolution.

(2) The commission may, by order, provide for the manner and conditions under which:

- (a) Marijuana items left by any deceased, insolvent or bankrupt person or licensee, or subject to a security interest, may be foreclosed, sold under execution or otherwise disposed of.
- (b) The business of any deceased, insolvent or bankrupt licensee may be operated for a reasonable period following the death, insolvency or bankruptcy.
- (c) A business licensed pursuant to sections 3 to 70 of this Act subject to a security interest may be continued in business by a secured party as defined in ORS 79.0102 for a reasonable period after default on the indebtedness by the debtor.

SECTION 26. License terms; licenses issued for less than year; determination of fees. (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all licenses under sections 3 to 70 of this Act and renewals thereof shall be issued for a period of one year which shall expire at 12 midnight on March 31, June 30, September 30 or December 31 of each year.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a license issued for the first time to an applicant may be issued for less than a year. The fee for a license issued for less than a year under this subsection is the annual license fee prescribed by section 28 of this Act.

SECTION 27. Delivery of marijuana. A marijuana producer, marijuana processor, or marijuana wholesaler shall deliver marijuana items only to or on a licensed premises. The sale of marijuana items under any license issued by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission for retail sales by a licensee shall be restricted to the premises described in the license, but deliveries may be made by the marijuana retailer to

consumers pursuant to bona fide orders received on the licensed premises prior to delivery.

SECTION 28. Application for license; rules; fees. (1) Any person desiring a license or renewal of a license under sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall make application to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission upon forms to be furnished by the commission showing the name and address of the applicant, location of the place of business that is to be operated under the license, and such other pertinent information as the commission may require. No license shall be granted or renewed until the applicant has complied with the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act and the rules of the commission.

(2) The commission may reject any application that is not submitted in the form required by rule. The commission shall give applicants an opportunity to be heard if an application is rejected. A hearing under this subsection is not subject to the requirements for contested case proceedings under ORS chapter 183.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, a revocation of, or a refusal to issue or renew, a license under sections 3 to 70 of this Act is subject to the requirements for contested case proceedings under ORS chapter 183.

(4) The commission shall assess a nonrefundable fee for processing a new or renewal application for any license authorized by sections 3 to 70 of this Act. The application processing fee shall be \$250.

(5) The annual license fee for any license granted under sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall be \$1,000. The license fee is nonrefundable and shall be paid by each applicant upon the granting or committing of a license.

SECTION 29. Grounds for refusing to issue license. (1) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may not license any applicant under the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act if the applicant is under 21 years of age.

(2) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may refuse to license any applicant under the provisions of sections 3 to 70 of this Act if the commission has reasonable ground to believe any of the following to be true:

(a) That there are sufficient licensed premises in the locality set out in the application, or that the granting of a license in the locality set out in the application is not demanded by public interest or convenience. In determining whether there are sufficient licensed premises in the locality, the commission shall consider seasonal fluctuations in the population of the locality and shall ensure that there are adequate licensed premises to serve the needs of the locality during the peak seasons.

(b) That the applicant:

(A) Is in the habit of using alcoholic beverages, habit-forming drugs, marijuana, or controlled substances to excess.

(B) Has made false statements to the commission.

(C) Is incompetent or physically unable to carry on the management of the establishment proposed to be licensed.

(D) Has been convicted of violating a general or local law of this state or another state, or of violating a federal law, if the conviction is substantially related to the fitness and ability of the applicant to lawfully carry out activities under the license.

(E) Has maintained an insanitary establishment.

(F) Is not of good repute and moral character.

(G) Did not have a good record of compliance with sections 3 to 70 of this Act or any rule of the commission adopted pursuant thereto.

(H) Is not the legitimate owner of the business proposed to be licensed, or other persons have ownership interests in the business which have not been disclosed.

(I) Is not possessed of or has not demonstrated financial responsibility sufficient to adequately meet the requirements of the business proposed to be licensed.

(J) Is unable to understand the laws of Oregon relating to marijuana or the rules of the commission.

(3) Notwithstanding subparagraph (D) of paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of this section, in determining whether the commission may refuse to license an applicant, the commission may not consider the prior conviction of the applicant or any owner, director, officer, manager, employee, agent, or other representative of the applicant for:

(a) The manufacture of marijuana, if:

(A) The date of the conviction is more than five years before the date of the application; and

(B) The person has not been convicted more than once for the manufacture or delivery of marijuana;

(b) The delivery of marijuana to a person 21 years of age or older, if:

(A) The date of the conviction is more than five years before the date of the application; and

(B) The person has not been convicted more than once for the manufacture or delivery of marijuana; or

(c) The possession of marijuana.

SECTION 30. Grounds for cancellation or suspension of license. (1) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may cancel or suspend any license issued under sections 3 to 70 of this Act, if the commission finds or has reasonable ground to believe any of the following to be true:

(a) That the licensee:

(A) Has violated any provision of sections 3 to 70 of this Act or any rule of the commission adopted pursuant thereto.

(B) Has made any false representation or statement to the commission in order to induce or prevent action by the commission.

(C) Has maintained an insanitary establishment.

(D) Is insolvent or incompetent or physically unable to carry on the management of the establishment of the licensee.

(E) Is in the habit of using alcoholic liquor, habit-forming drugs, marijuana, or controlled substances to excess.

(F) Has misrepresented to a customer or the public any marijuana items sold by the licensee.

(G) Since the granting of the license, has been convicted of a felony, of violating any of the marijuana laws of this state, general or local, or of any misdemeanor or violation of any municipal ordinance committed on the licensed premises.

(b) That there is any other reason that, in the opinion of the commission, based on public convenience or necessity, warrants canceling or suspending such license.

(2) Civil penalties under this section shall be imposed as provided in ORS 183.745.

(Marijuana Tax)

SECTION 31. Administration by Oregon Liquor Control Commission. The Oregon Liquor Control Commission shall administer sections 31 to 44 of this Act, and shall prescribe forms and make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to enforce sections 31 to 44 of this Act.

SECTION 32. Definition of "sale". (1) As used in sections 31 to 44 of this Act, "sale" or "sold" means any transfer, exchange or barter, in any manner or by any means, for a consideration, and includes and means all sales made by any person. It includes a gift by a person engaged in the business of selling marijuana, for advertising, as a means of evading sections 31 to 44 of this Act, or for any other purpose.

(2) If a marijuana producer also holds one or more processor licenses, one or more wholesale licenses, or one or more retail licenses, a sale of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, or immature marijuana plants will be deemed to occur if and when the marijuana producer processes or takes any other action with respect to such marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, or immature marijuana plants for which a processor license, wholesale license, or retail license is required, regardless of whether the marijuana producer continues to own or possess the marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, or immature marijuana plants.

SECTION 33. Tax on marijuana. (1) A tax is imposed upon the privilege of engaging in business as a marijuana producer at the rate of:

(a) \$35 per ounce on all marijuana flowers;

(b) \$10 per ounce on all marijuana leaves; and

(c) \$5 per immature marijuana plant.

(2) The rates of tax imposed by this section upon marijuana flowers and marijuana leaves apply proportionately to quantities of less than one ounce.

(3) The tax imposed by this section shall be measured by the quantities of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants produced and sold by any marijuana producer. The taxes specified in this section shall be levied and assessed to the marijuana producer at the time of the first sale of the marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants by the marijuana producer.

(4) For reporting periods beginning on or after July 1, 2017, the rates of tax under subsection (1) of this section shall be adjusted for each biennium according to the cost-of-living adjustment for the calendar year. The Oregon Liquor Control Commission shall recompute the rates for each biennium by adding to each rate in subsection (1) of this section the product obtained by multiplying the rate by a factor that is equal to 0.25 multiplied by the percentage (if any) by which the monthly averaged U.S. City Average Consumer Price Index for the 12 consecutive months ending August 31 of the prior calendar year exceeds the monthly averaged U.S. City Average Consumer Price Index for the 12 consecutive months ending August 31, 2015.

(5) The commission shall regularly review the rates of tax under subsection (1) of this section and make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly regarding appropriate adjustments to the rates that will further the purposes of:

(a) Maximizing net revenue;

(b) Minimizing the illegal marijuana industry under Oregon law; and

(c) Discouraging the use of marijuana by minors under 21 years of age.

SECTION 34. Payment of taxes; refunds; interest or penalty; appeal. (1) The privilege tax imposed by section 33 of this Act shall be paid to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission. The taxes covering the periods for which statements are required to be rendered by section 35 of this Act shall be paid before the time for filing such statements expires. If not so paid, a penalty of 10 percent and interest at the rate of one percent a month or fraction of a month shall be added and collected. The commission may refund any tax payment imposed upon or paid in error by any licensee.

(2) The commission may waive any interest or penalty assessed to a marijuana producer subject to the tax imposed under section 33 of this Act if the commission, in its discretion, determines that the marijuana producer has made a good faith attempt to comply with the requirements of sections 31 to 44 of this Act.

(3) Except in the case of fraud, the commission may not assess any interest or penalty on any tax due under section 33 of this Act following the expiration of 36 months from the date on which was filed the statement required under section 35 of this Act reporting the quantities of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants upon which the tax is due.

(4) A marijuana producer may appeal a tax imposed under section 33 of this Act in the manner of a contested case under ORS chapter 183.

SECTION 35. Statements by marijuana producers as to quantities sold. On or before the 20th day of each month, every marijuana producer shall file with the Oregon Liquor Control Commission a statement of the quantities of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants sold by the marijuana producer during the preceding calendar month.

SECTION 36. Estimate by Oregon Liquor Control Commission when statement not filed or false statement filed. If any marijuana producer fails, neglects or refuses to file a statement required by section 35 of this Act or files a false statement, the Oregon Liquor Control Commission shall estimate the quantities of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants sold by the marijuana producer and assess the privilege taxes thereon. The marijuana producer shall be estopped from complaining of the quantities so estimated.

SECTION 37. Lien created by the tax. The privilege tax required to be paid by section 33 of this Act constitutes a lien upon, and has the effect of an execution duly levied against, any and all property of the marijuana producer, attaching at the time the marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants subject to the tax were sold, and remaining until the tax is paid. The lien created by this section is paramount to all private liens or encumbrances.

SECTION 38. Records to be kept by marijuana producers. Every marijuana producer shall keep a complete and accurate record of all sales of marijuana flowers, marijuana leaves, and immature marijuana plants, and a complete and accurate record of the number of ounces of marijuana flowers produced, the number of ounces of marijuana leaves produced, the number of immature marijuana plants produced, and the dates of production. The records shall be in such form and contain such other information as the Oregon Liquor Control Commission may prescribe.

SECTION 39. Inspection of marijuana producer's records; records to be kept for prescribed period. (1) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may, at any time, examine the books and records of any marijuana producer, and may appoint auditors, investigators and other employees that the commission considers necessary to enforce its powers and perform its duties under sections 31 to 44 of this Act.

(2) Every marijuana producer shall maintain and keep for two years all records, books and accounts required by sections 31 to 44 of this Act and shall provide copies of those records, books and accounts to the commission when requested by the commission.

SECTION 40. Failure to pay tax or maintain records. (1) No marijuana producer shall:

(a) Fail to pay the privilege tax prescribed in section 33 of this Act when it is due; or

(b) Falsify the statement required by section 35 of this Act.

(2) No person shall:

(a) Refuse to permit the Oregon Liquor Control Commission or any of its representatives to make an inspection of the books and records authorized by sections 38 and 39 of this Act;

(b) Fail to keep books of account prescribed by the commission or required by sections 31 to 44 of this Act;

(c) Fail to preserve the books for two years for inspection of the commission; or

(d) Alter, cancel or obliterate entries in the books of account for the purpose of falsifying any record required by sections 31 to 44 of this Act to be made, maintained or preserved.

SECTION 41. Applicability to interstate and foreign commerce. Sections 31 to 44 of this Act do not apply to commerce with foreign nations or commerce with the several states, except in so far as the same may be permitted under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SECTION 42. State has exclusive right to tax marijuana. No county or city of this state shall impose any fee or tax, including occupation taxes, privilege taxes and inspection fees, in connection with the purchase, sale, production, processing, transportation, and delivery of marijuana items.

(Distribution of Moneys)

SECTION 43. Disposition of moneys; revolving fund. (1) All money collected by the Oregon Liquor Control Commission under sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall be remitted to the State Treasurer who shall credit it to a suspense account of the commission. Whenever the commission determines that moneys have been received by it in excess of the amount legally due and payable to the commission or that it has received money to which it has no legal interest, or that any license fee or deposit is properly refundable, the commission is authorized and directed to refund such money by check drawn upon the State Treasurer and charged to the suspense account of the commission. After withholding refundable license fees and such sum, not to exceed \$250,000, as it considers necessary as a revolving fund for a working cash balance for the purpose of paying travel expenses, advances, other miscellaneous bills and extraordinary items which are payable in cash immediately upon presentation, the commission shall direct the State Treasurer to transfer the money remaining in the suspense account to the Oregon Marijuana Account established under section 44 of this Act. Moneys in the Oregon Marijuana Account are continuously appropriated to the commission to be distributed and used as required or allowed by Oregon law.

(2) All necessary expenditures of the commission incurred in carrying out sections 3 to 70 of this Act, including such sums necessary to reimburse the \$250,000 revolving fund, shall be paid from the Oregon Marijuana Account.

SECTION 44. Distribution of available moneys in Oregon Marijuana Account. (1) There is established the Oregon Marijuana Account, separate and distinct from the General Fund.

(2) At the end of each month, the Oregon Liquor Control Commission shall certify the amount of moneys available for distribution in the Oregon Marijuana Account and, after withholding such moneys as it may deem necessary to carry out its obligations under sections 3 to 70 of this Act, shall within 35 days of the month for which a distribution is made distribute the moneys as follows:

(a) Forty percent shall be transferred to the Common School Fund;

(b) Twenty percent shall be transferred to the Mental Health Alcoholism and Drug Services Account established under ORS 430.380;

(c) Fifteen percent shall be transferred to the State Police Account established under ORS 181.175;

(d) To assist local law enforcement in performing its duties under this Act, ten percent shall be transferred to the cities of the state in the following shares:

(A) For all distributions made from the Oregon Marijuana Account before July 1, 2017, in such shares as the population of each city bears to the population of the cities of the state, as determined by the State Board of Higher Education last preceding such apportionment, under ORS 190.510 to 190.610; and

(B) For all distributions made from the Oregon Marijuana Account on or after July 1, 2017:

(i) Fifty percent of such ten percent shall be transferred in such shares as the number of licenses issued by the commission under sections 19 to 21 of this Act during the calendar year preceding the date of the distribution for premises located in each city bears to the number of such licenses issued by the commission during such calendar year for all premises in the state; and

(ii) Fifty percent of such ten percent shall be transferred in such shares as the number of licenses issued by the commission under section 22 of this Act during the calendar year preceding the date of the distribution for premises located in each city bears to the number of such licenses issued by the commission during such calendar year for all premises in the state;

(e) To assist local law enforcement in performing its duties under this Act, ten percent shall be transferred to counties in the following shares:

(A) For all distributions made from the Oregon Marijuana Account before July 1, 2017, in such shares as their respective populations bear to the total population of the state, as estimated from time to time by the State Board of Higher Education; and

(B) For all distributions made from the Oregon Marijuana Account on or after July 1, 2017:

(i) Fifty percent of such ten percent shall be transferred in such shares as the number of licenses issued by the commission under sections 19 to 21 of this Act during the calendar year preceding the date of the distribution for premises located in each county bears to the number of such licenses issued by the commission during such calendar year for all premises in the state; and

(ii) Fifty percent of such ten percent shall be transferred in such shares as the number of licenses issued by the commission under section 22 of this Act during the calendar year preceding the date of the distribution for premises located in each county bears to the number of such licenses issued by the commission during such calendar year for all premises in the state; and

(f) Five percent shall be transferred to the Oregon Health Authority to be used for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of alcohol and drug abuse prevention, early intervention and treatment services.

(3) It is the intent of this section that the moneys distributed from the Oregon Marijuana Account to the distributees in subsection (2) of this section are in addition to any other available moneys to such distributees and do not supplant moneys available from any other source.

(Prohibitions Relating to Marijuana)

SECTION 45. Importing and exporting marijuana prohibited.

(1) Marijuana items may not be imported into this state

or exported from this state by any licensee or licensee representative.

(2) A violation of subsection (1) of this section is a:

(a) Class C felony, if the importation or exportation is for consideration; or

(b) Class A misdemeanor, if the importation or exportation is not for consideration.

SECTION 46. Marijuana may not be given as prize. Marijuana items may not be given as a prize, premium or consideration for a lottery, contest, game of chance or skill, or competition of any kind.

SECTION 47. Providing marijuana to intoxicated person; allowing consumption by minor on property. (1) A person may not sell, give or otherwise make available any marijuana items to any person who is visibly intoxicated.

(2)(a) A person who exercises control over private real property may not knowingly allow any other person under the age of 21 years to consume marijuana items on the property, or allow any other person under the age of 21 years to remain on the property if the person under the age of 21 years consumes marijuana items on the property.

(b) This subsection:

(A) Applies only to a person who is present and in control of the location at the time the consumption occurs; and

(B) Does not apply to the owner of rental property, or the agent of an owner of rental property, unless the consumption occurs in the individual unit in which the owner or agent resides.

SECTION 48. Misrepresentation by licensee and others; maintenance of disorderly establishment. (1) No person shall make false representations or statements to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission in order to induce or prevent action by the commission.

(2) No licensee of the commission shall maintain a noisy, lewd, disorderly or insanitary establishment or supply impure or otherwise deleterious marijuana items.

(3) No licensee of the commission shall misrepresent to a customer or to the public any marijuana items.

SECTION 49. Attempted purchase of marijuana by person under 21; entry of licensed premises by person under 21. (1) A person under 21 years of age may not attempt to purchase marijuana items.

(2) Except as authorized by rule or as necessitated in an emergency, a person under 21 years of age may not enter or attempt to enter any portion of a licensed premises that is posted or otherwise identified as being prohibited to the use of minors.

(3) A person who violates subsection (1) or (2) of this section commits a Class B violation.

(4) In addition to and not in lieu of any other penalty established by law, a person under 21 years of age who violates subsection (1) of this section through misrepresentation of age may be required to perform community service and the court shall order that the person's driving privileges and right to apply for driving privileges be suspended for a period not to exceed one year. If a court has issued an order suspending driving privileges under this section, the court, upon petition of the person, may withdraw the order at any time the court deems appropriate. The court notification to the Department of Transportation under this subsection may include a recommendation that the person be granted a hardship permit under ORS 807.240 if the person is otherwise eligible for the permit.

(5) If a person cited under this section is at least 13 years of age but less than 21 years of age at the time the person is found in default under ORS 153.102 or 419C.472 for failure to appear, in addition to and not in lieu of any other penalty, the court shall issue notice under ORS 809.220 to the department for the department to suspend the person's driving privileges under ORS 809.280 (4).

(6) The prohibitions of this section do not apply to a person under 21 years of age who is acting under the direction of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission or under the direction of state or local law enforcement agencies for the purpose of investigating possible violations of laws prohibiting sales of marijuana items to persons who are under 21 years of age.

SECTION 50. Compliance with standards. (1) No marijuana items shall be sold or offered for sale within this state unless such marijuana items comply with the minimum standards fixed pursuant to law.

(2) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may require a marijuana producer, marijuana processor, or marijuana wholesaler to provide a laboratory analysis demonstrating to the satisfaction of the commission that particular marijuana items comply with the minimum standards in this state.

(3) No marijuana items offered for sale within this state may be altered or tampered with in any way by any person not licensed to do so by the commission.

(4) The commission may prohibit the sale of any marijuana items for a reasonable period of time while it is determining whether the marijuana items comply with minimum standards in this state.

SECTION 51. Use of misleading mark or label on container; injurious or adulterated ingredients. (1) No licensee shall use or allow the use of any mark or label on the container of any marijuana items which are kept for sale, if the container does not precisely and clearly indicate the nature of its contents or in any way might deceive any customer as to the nature, composition, quantity, age or quality of such marijuana items.

(2) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may prohibit any licensee from selling any brand of marijuana items which in its judgment is deceptively labeled or branded as to content, or contains injurious or adulterated ingredients.

SECTION 52. Minimum age requirement. (1) A licensee may not employ any person under 21 years of age in any part of any licensed premises.

(2) During any inspection of a licensed premises, the Oregon Liquor Control Commission may require proof that a person performing work at the premises is 21 years of age or older. If the person does not provide the commission with acceptable proof of age upon request, the commission may require the person to immediately cease any activity and leave the premises until the commission receives acceptable proof of age. This subsection does not apply to a person temporarily at the premises to make a service, maintenance or repair call or for other purposes independent of the premises operations.

(3) If a person performing work has not provided proof of age requested by the commission under subsection (2) of this section, the commission may request that the licensee provide proof that the person is 21 years of age or older. Failure of the licensee to respond to a request made under this subsection by providing acceptable proof of age for a person is prima facie evidence that the licensee has allowed the person to perform work at the licensed premises in violation of the minimum age requirement.

SECTION 53. Mature marijuana plants. (1) Except for licensed marijuana producers and their licensee representatives, no

licensee may possess a mature marijuana plant.

(2) No licensee may sell a mature marijuana plant.

SECTION 54. Use of marijuana in public place prohibited. (1) It is unlawful for any person to engage in the use of marijuana items in a public place.

(2) A violation of subsection (1) of this section is a Class B violation.

SECTION 55. Possession of marijuana in correctional facility prohibited. (1) It is unlawful for any person to possess or engage in the use of marijuana items in a correctional facility as defined in ORS 162.135 or in a youth correction facility as defined in ORS 162.135.

(2) A violation of subsection (1) of this section is a Class B violation.

SECTION 56. Homegrown marijuana in public view prohibited. (1) No person may produce, process, keep, or store homegrown marijuana or homemade marijuana products if the homegrown marijuana or homemade marijuana products can be readily seen by normal unaided vision from a public place.

(2) A violation of subsection (1) of this section is a Class B violation.

SECTION 57. Homemade marijuana extracts prohibited. No person may produce, process, keep, or store homemade marijuana extracts.

(Cities and Counties; Local Option)

SECTION 58. Marijuana laws supersede and repeal inconsistent charters and ordinances. Sections 3 to 70 of this Act, designed to operate uniformly throughout the state, shall be paramount and superior to and shall fully replace and supersede any and all municipal charter enactments or local ordinances inconsistent with it. Such charters and ordinances hereby are repealed.

SECTION 59. Authority of cities and counties over establishments that serve marijuana. (1) Cities and counties may adopt reasonable time, place and manner regulations of the nuisance aspects of establishments that sell marijuana to consumers if the city or county makes specific findings that the establishment would cause adverse effects to occur.

(2) The authority granted to cities and counties by this section is in addition to, and not in lieu of, the authority granted to a city or county under its charter and the statutes and Constitution of this state.

SECTION 60. Petition and election for local option. (1) The governing body of a city or a county, when a petition is filed as provided in this section, shall order an election on the question whether the operation of licensed premises shall be prohibited in the city or county.

(2) Except as provided in subsections (3), (4) and (5) of this section, the requirements for preparing, circulating and filing a petition under this section:

(a) In the case of a city, shall be as provided for an initiative petition under ORS 250.265 to 250.346.

(b) In the case of a county, shall be as provided for an initiative petition under ORS 250.165 to 250.235.

(3) A petition under subsection (2) of this section:

(a) Must be filed not less than 60 days before the day of the election; and

(b) Must be signed by not less than 10 percent of the electors registered in the city or county.

(4) If ORS 250.155 makes ORS 250.165 to 250.235 inapplicable to a county or if ORS 250.255 makes ORS 250.265 to 250.346

inapplicable to a city, the requirements for preparing, circulating and filing a petition under this section shall be as provided for an initiative petition under the county or city charter or an ordinance adopted under the county or city charter.

(5) No signature is valid unless signed within 180 days before the petition is filed.

(6) An election under this section shall be held at the time of the next statewide general election.

(7) An election under this section shall be conducted under ORS chapters 246 to 260.

SECTION 61. Sales not affected by local option laws. Section 60 of this Act shall not prevent any person residing in the county or city from having, for personal use, marijuana items purchased from marijuana retailers duly licensed under this Act.

SECTION 62. Effective date of local option. In each county or city that returns a majority vote for or against prohibition, the law shall take effect on January 1 following the day of election.

(Enforcement of Marijuana Laws)

SECTION 63. Duty of officers to enforce and to inform district attorney. The state police, sheriffs, constables and all police officers within the State of Oregon shall enforce sections 3 to 30 of this Act and sections 45 to 70 of this Act and assist the Oregon Liquor Control Commission in detecting violations of sections 3 to 30 of this Act and sections 45 to 70 of this Act and apprehending offenders. Each such enforcing officer having notice, knowledge or reasonable ground of suspicion of any violation of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act shall immediately notify the district attorney, and furnish the district attorney with names and addresses of any witnesses, or other information within the officer's knowledge, of such violation.

SECTION 64. Confiscation of marijuana and property. (1) Whenever any officer arrests any person for violation of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act, the officer may take into possession all marijuana items, and other property which the person so arrested has in possession, or on the premises, which is apparently being used in violation of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act.

(2) If the person so arrested is convicted, and it is found that the marijuana items, and other property has been used in violation of Oregon law:

(a) The marijuana items shall be forfeited to an appropriate state or local law enforcement agency, and shall be delivered by the court or officer to the law enforcement agency; and

(b) Subject to other applicable law, the other property shall be forfeited to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, and shall be delivered by the court or officer to the commission.

(3) The commission is authorized to destroy or make such other disposition of any property it receives under paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of this section as it considers to be in the public interest. In any such case, all such property, including lockers, chairs, tables, cash registers, music devices, gambling devices, furniture, furnishings, equipment and facilities for the storing, serving or using of marijuana items shall be confiscated and forfeited to the state, and the clear proceeds shall be deposited with the State Treasury in the Common School Fund in the manner provided in this section.

SECTION 65. Duty to notify Oregon Liquor Control Commission of conviction of licensee. The county courts, district attorneys and municipal authorities, immediately upon the conviction of any licensee of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission of a violation of any provision of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act or

the violation of any other law of this state or ordinance of any municipality therein, in which violation marijuana had any part, shall notify the commission thereof. Such officials shall notify the commission of any acts, practices or other conduct of any such licensee which may be subversive of the general welfare or contrary to the spirit of this Act and shall recommend such action on the part of the commission as will remove the evil.

SECTION 66. Property and places as common nuisances. Any room, house, building, boat, structure or place of any kind where marijuana items are sold, manufactured, bartered or given away in violation of Oregon law, or where persons are permitted to resort for the purpose of using marijuana items in violation of Oregon law, or any place where marijuana items are kept for sale, barter or gift in violation of Oregon law, and all marijuana items or property subject to confiscation under section 64 of this Act kept and used in such place is a common nuisance. Any person who maintains or assists in maintaining such common nuisance or knowingly suffers or permits such nuisance to exist in any place of which the person is the owner, manager or lessor, shall be guilty of a violation of sections 3 to 30 of this Act and sections 45 to 70 of this Act.

SECTION 67. Lien on place used to unlawfully handle marijuana. If it is proved that the owner of any building or premises knowingly has suffered the same to be used or occupied for the manufacture, sale or possession of marijuana items, contrary to the provisions of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act, such building or premises are subject to a lien for, and may be sold to pay all fines and costs assessed against their occupants for any violation of sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act. The lien shall be enforced immediately by civil action in any court having jurisdiction, by the district attorney of the county wherein the building or premises are located.

SECTION 68. Governor authorized to suspend license. In case of invasion, disaster, insurrection, riot, or imminent danger thereof, the Governor may, for the duration of such invasion, disaster, insurrection, riot, or imminent danger thereof, immediately suspend without notice any license in the area involved granted under sections 3 to 30 of this Act or sections 45 to 70 of this Act.

(Penalties)

SECTION 69. Penalties. (1) Except where other punishment is specifically provided for in sections 3 to 70 of this Act, violation of any provision of sections 3 to 70 of this Act is a Class A misdemeanor.

(2) A violation of subsection (1) of section 40 of this Act is a Class B misdemeanor.

(3) Subject to ORS 153.022, violation of any regulation promulgated under paragraph (e) of subsection (2) of section 7 of this Act is a Class C violation.

SECTION 70. Severability. If any sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, or words of sections 3 to 70 of this Act shall be held unconstitutional, void, or illegal, either on their face or as applied, this shall not affect the applicability, constitutionality, or legality of any other sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, and words of sections 3 to 70 of this Act. To that end, the sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, and words of sections 3 to 70 of this Act are intended to be severable. It is hereby declared to be the intent of sections 3 to 70 of this Act that sections 3 to 70 of this Act would have been adopted had such unconstitutional, void, or illegal sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, or words, if any, not been included in sections 3 to 70 of this Act.

SECTION 71. Section 280E of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 280E of the Internal Revenue Code does not apply for purposes of determining taxable income or loss under this chapter.

SECTION 72. Definition of controlled substance. As used in the following statutes and any rule adopted thereunder, the term “controlled substance” shall not include marijuana:

(1) ORS 475.125 to ORS 475.165 (registration with the State Board of Pharmacy).

(2) ORS 475.175 to ORS 475.190 (records).

SECTION 73. Use of marijuana while driving; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of use of marijuana while driving if the person uses any marijuana while driving a motor vehicle upon a highway.

(2) The offense described in this section, use of marijuana while driving, is a Class B traffic violation.

SECTION 74. ORS 316.680, as amended by section 3, chapter 194, Oregon Laws 2013, is amended to read:

316.680 Modification of taxable income. (1) There shall be subtracted from federal taxable income:

(a) The interest or dividends on obligations of the United States and its territories and possessions or of any authority, commission or instrumentality of the United States to the extent includable in gross income for federal income tax purposes but exempt from state income taxes under the laws of the United States. However, the amount subtracted under this paragraph shall be reduced by any interest on indebtedness incurred to carry the obligations or securities described in this paragraph, and by any expenses incurred in the production of interest or dividend income described in this paragraph to the extent that such expenses, including amortizable bond premiums, are deductible in determining federal taxable income.

(b) The amount of any federal income taxes accrued by the taxpayer during the taxable year as described in ORS 316.685, less the amount of any refunds of federal taxes previously accrued for which a tax benefit was received.

(c) Amounts allowable under sections 2621(a)(2) and 2622(b) of the Internal Revenue Code to the extent that the taxpayer does not elect under section 642(g) of the Internal Revenue Code to reduce federal taxable income by those amounts.

(d) Any supplemental payments made to JOBS Plus Program participants under ORS 411.892.

(e)(A) Federal pension income that is attributable to federal employment occurring before October 1, 1991. Federal pension income that is attributable to federal employment occurring before October 1, 1991, shall be determined by multiplying the total amount of federal pension income for the tax year by the ratio of the number of months of federal creditable service occurring before October 1, 1991, over the total number of months of federal creditable service.

(B) The subtraction allowed under this paragraph applies only to federal pension income received at a time when:

(i) Benefit increases provided under chapter 569, Oregon Laws 1995, are in effect; or

(ii) Public Employees Retirement System benefits received for service prior to October 1, 1991, are exempt from state income tax.

(C) As used in this paragraph:

(i) “Federal creditable service” means those periods of time for which a federal employee earned a federal pension.

(ii) “Federal pension” means any form of retirement allowance provided by the federal government, its agencies or its instrumentalities to retirees of the federal government or their beneficiaries.

(f) Any amount included in federal taxable income for the tax

year that is attributable to the conversion of a regular individual retirement account into a Roth individual retirement account described in section 408A of the Internal Revenue Code, to the extent that:

(A) The amount was subject to the income tax of another state or the District of Columbia in a prior tax year; and

(B) The taxpayer was a resident of the other state or the District of Columbia for that prior tax year.

(g) Any amounts awarded to the taxpayer by the Public Safety Memorial Fund Board under ORS 243.954 to 243.974 to the extent that the taxpayer has not taken the amount as a deduction in determining the taxpayer’s federal taxable income for the tax year.

(h) If included in taxable income for federal tax purposes, the amount withdrawn during the tax year in qualified withdrawals from a college savings network account established under ORS 348.841 to 348.873.

(i) For income tax years commencing on or after January 1, 2015, the amount of any deductions or credits that the taxpayer would have been allowed but for the provisions of section 280E of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) There shall be added to federal taxable income:

(a) Interest or dividends, exempt from federal income tax, on obligations or securities of any foreign state or of a political subdivision or authority of any foreign state. However, the amount added under this paragraph shall be reduced by any interest on indebtedness incurred to carry the obligations or securities described in this paragraph and by any expenses incurred in the production of interest or dividend income described in this paragraph.

(b) Interest or dividends on obligations of any authority, commission, instrumentality and territorial possession of the United States that by the laws of the United States are exempt from federal income tax but not from state income taxes. However, the amount added under this paragraph shall be reduced by any interest on indebtedness incurred to carry the obligations or securities described in this paragraph and by any expenses incurred in the production of interest or dividend income described in this paragraph.

(c) The amount of any federal estate taxes allocable to income in respect of a decedent not taxable by Oregon.

(d) The amount of any allowance for depletion in excess of the taxpayer’s adjusted basis in the property depleted, deducted on the taxpayer’s federal income tax return for the taxable year, pursuant to sections 613, 613A, 614, 616 and 617 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(e) For taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1985, the dollar amount deducted under section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code for personal exemptions for the taxable year.

(f) The amount taken as a deduction on the taxpayer’s federal return for unused qualified business credits under section 196 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(g) The amount of any increased benefits paid to a taxpayer under chapter 569, Oregon Laws 1995, under the provisions of chapter 796, Oregon Laws 1991, and under section 26, chapter 815, Oregon Laws 1991, that is not includable in the taxpayer’s federal taxable income under the Internal Revenue Code.

(h) The amount of any long term care insurance premiums paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the tax year if:

(A) The amount is taken into account as a deduction on the taxpayer’s federal return for the tax year; and

(B) The taxpayer claims the credit allowed under ORS 315.610 for the tax year.

(i) Any amount taken as a deduction under section 1341 of the Internal Revenue Code in computing federal taxable income for the tax year, if the taxpayer has claimed a credit for claim of right income repayment adjustment under ORS 315.068.

(j) If the taxpayer makes a nonqualified withdrawal, as defined in ORS 348.841, from a college savings network account established under ORS 348.841 to 348.873, the amount of the withdrawal that is attributable to contributions that were subtracted from federal taxable income under ORS 316.699.

(3) Discount and gain or loss on retirement or disposition of obligations described under subsection (2)(a) of this section issued on or after January 1, 1985, shall be treated for purposes of this chapter in the same manner as under sections 1271 to 1283 and other pertinent sections of the Internal Revenue Code as if the obligations, although issued by a foreign state or a political subdivision of a foreign state, were not tax exempt under the Internal Revenue Code.

SECTION 75. ORS 475.525 is amended to read:

475.525 Sale of drug paraphernalia prohibited; definition of drug paraphernalia; exceptions. (1) It is unlawful for any person to sell or deliver, possess with intent to sell or deliver or manufacture with intent to sell or deliver drug paraphernalia, knowing that it will be used to unlawfully plant, propagate, cultivate, grow, harvest, manufacture, compound, convert, produce, process, prepare, test, analyze, pack, repack, store, contain, conceal, inject, ingest, inhale or otherwise introduce into the human body a controlled substance as defined by ORS 475.005.

(2) For the purposes of this section, "drug paraphernalia" means all equipment, products and materials of any kind which are marketed for use or designed for use in planting, propagating, cultivating, growing, harvesting, manufacturing, compounding, converting, producing, processing, preparing, testing, analyzing, packaging, repackaging, storing, containing, concealing, injecting, ingesting, inhaling or otherwise introducing into the human body a controlled substance in violation of ORS 475.840 to 475.980. Drug paraphernalia includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Kits marketed for use or designed for use in unlawfully planting, propagating, cultivating, growing or harvesting of any species of plant which is a controlled substance or from which a controlled substance can be derived;

(b) Kits marketed for use or designed for use in manufacturing, compounding, converting, producing, processing or preparing controlled substances;

(c) Isomerization devices marketed for use or designed for use in increasing the potency of any species of plant which is a controlled substance;

(d) Testing equipment marketed for use or designed for use in identifying or in analyzing the strength, effectiveness or purity of controlled substances;

(e) Scales and balances marketed for use or designed for use in weighing or measuring controlled substances;

(f) Diluents and adulterants, such as quinine hydrochloride, mannitol, mannite, dextrose and lactose, marketed for use or designed for use in cutting controlled substances;

(g) Separation gins and sifters marketed for use or designed for use in removing twigs and seeds from, or in otherwise cleaning or refining marijuana;

(h) Containers and other objects marketed for use or designed for use in storing or concealing controlled substances; and

(i) Objects marketed for use or designed specifically for use in ingesting, inhaling or otherwise introducing marijuana, cocaine, hashish or hashish oil into the human body, such as:

(A) Metal, wooden, acrylic, glass, stone, plastic or ceramic

pipes with or without screens, permanent screens or hashish heads;

(B) Water pipes;

(C) Carburetion tubes and devices;

(D) Smoking and carburetion masks;

(E) Roach clips, meaning objects used to hold burning material that has become too small or too short to be held in the hand, such as a marijuana cigarette;

(F) Miniature cocaine spoons and cocaine vials;

(G) Chamber pipes;

(H) Carburetor pipes;

(I) Electric pipes;

(J) Air-driven pipes;

(K) Chillums;

(L) Bongs;

(M) Ice pipes or chillers; and

(N) Lighting equipment specifically designed for the growing of controlled substances.

(3) Drug paraphernalia does not include hypodermic syringes or needles.

(4) For the purposes of this section, "marijuana paraphernalia" means all equipment, products and materials of any kind which are marketed for use or designed for use in planting, propagating, cultivating, growing, harvesting, manufacturing, compounding, converting, producing, processing, preparing, testing, analyzing, packaging, repackaging, storing, containing, concealing, injecting, ingesting, inhaling or otherwise introducing into the human body marijuana in violation of ORS 475.840 to 475.980.

[(4)] **(5)** In determining whether an object is drug paraphernalia or marijuana paraphernalia, a trier of fact should consider, in addition to all other relevant factors, the following:

(a) Instructions, oral or written, provided with the object concerning its use;

(b) Descriptive materials accompanying the object which explain or depict its use;

(c) National and local advertising concerning its use;

(d) The manner in which the object is displayed for sale;

(e) The existence and scope of legitimate uses for the object in the community; and

(f) Any expert testimony which may be introduced concerning its use.

[(5)] **(6)** The provisions of ORS 475.525 to 475.565 do not apply to persons registered under the provisions of ORS 475.125 or to persons specified as exempt from registration under the provisions of that statute.

(7) The provisions of ORS 475.525 to 475.565 do not apply to a person who sells or delivers marijuana paraphernalia to a person 21 years of age or older.

SECTION 76. ORS 475.752, as amended by section 3, chapter 591, Oregon Laws 2013, is amended to read:

475.752 Prohibited acts generally; penalties; affirmative defense for certain peyote uses; causing death by Schedule IV substance. (1) Except for licensees and licensee representatives as defined in subsections (10) and (11) of section 5 of this Act, and except for a person acting within the scope

of and in compliance with subsection (1) of section 6 of this Act, and except as authorized by ORS 475.005 to 475.285 and 475.752 to 475.980, it is unlawful for any person to manufacture or deliver a controlled substance. Any person who violates this subsection with respect to:

(a) A controlled substance in Schedule I, is guilty of a Class A felony, except as otherwise provided in ORS 475.886 and 475.890.

(b) A controlled substance in Schedule II, is guilty of a Class B felony, except as otherwise provided in ORS 475.858, 475.860, 475.862, 475.878, 475.880, 475.882, 475.904 and 475.906.

(c) A controlled substance in Schedule III, is guilty of a Class C felony, except as otherwise provided in ORS 475.904 and 475.906.

(d) A controlled substance in Schedule IV, is guilty of a Class B misdemeanor.

(e) A controlled substance in Schedule V, is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor.

(2) Except as authorized in ORS 475.005 to 475.285 and 475.752 to 475.980, it is unlawful for any person to create or deliver a counterfeit substance. Any person who violates this subsection with respect to:

(a) A counterfeit substance in Schedule I, is guilty of a Class A felony.

(b) A counterfeit substance in Schedule II, is guilty of a Class B felony.

(c) A counterfeit substance in Schedule III, is guilty of a Class C felony.

(d) A counterfeit substance in Schedule IV, is guilty of a Class B misdemeanor.

(e) A counterfeit substance in Schedule V, is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor.

(3) It is unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to possess a controlled substance, **other than marijuana**, unless the substance was obtained directly from, or pursuant to a valid prescription or order of, a practitioner while acting in the course of professional practice, or except as otherwise authorized by ORS 475.005 to 475.285 and 475.752 to 475.980. Any person who violates this subsection with respect to:

(a) A controlled substance in Schedule I, is guilty of a Class B felony, except as otherwise provided in ORS 475.894.

(b) A controlled substance in Schedule II, is guilty of a Class C felony, except as otherwise provided in ORS 475.864.

(c) A controlled substance in Schedule III, is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor.

(d) A controlled substance in Schedule IV, is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor.

(e) A controlled substance in Schedule V, is guilty of a violation.

(4) In any prosecution under this section for manufacture, possession or delivery of that plant of the genus *Lophophora* commonly known as peyote, it is an affirmative defense that the peyote is being used or is intended for use:

(a) In connection with the good faith practice of a religious belief;

(b) As directly associated with a religious practice; and

(c) In a manner that is not dangerous to the health of the user or others who are in the proximity of the user.

(5) The affirmative defense created in subsection (4) of this

section is not available to any person who has possessed or delivered the peyote while incarcerated in a correctional facility in this state.

(6)(a) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a person who unlawfully manufactures or delivers a controlled substance in Schedule IV and who thereby causes death to another person is guilty of a Class C felony.

(b) For purposes of this subsection, causation is established when the controlled substance plays a substantial role in the death of the other person.

SECTION 77. ORS 475.856, as amended by section 1, chapter 591, Oregon Laws 2013, is amended to read:

475.856 Unlawful manufacture of marijuana. (1) [It] **Except for licensees and licensee representatives as defined in subsections (10) and (11) of section 5 of this Act, and except for a person acting within the scope of and in compliance with subsection (1) of section 6 of this Act, it is unlawful for any person to manufacture marijuana.**

(2) Unlawful manufacture of marijuana is a Class B felony.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2) of this section, unlawful manufacture of marijuana is a Class B misdemeanor, if a person 21 years of age or older manufactures homegrown marijuana at a household and the total number of homegrown marijuana plants at the household exceeds four marijuana plants but does not exceed eight marijuana plants.

(4) As used in subsection (3) of this section, the terms "homegrown" and "household" have the meanings given to them in section 5 of this Act.

SECTION 78. ORS 475.860 is amended to read:

475.860 Unlawful delivery of marijuana. (1) [It] **Except for licensees and licensee representatives as defined in subsections (10) and (11) of section 5 of this Act, and except for a person acting within the scope of and in compliance with subsection (1) of section 6 of this Act, it is unlawful for any person to deliver marijuana.**

(2) Unlawful delivery of marijuana is a:

(a) Class B felony if the delivery is for consideration.

(b) Class C felony if the delivery is for no consideration.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2) of this section, unlawful delivery of marijuana is a:

(a) Class A misdemeanor, if the delivery is for no consideration and consists of less than one avoirdupois ounce of the dried leaves, stems and flowers of the plant *Cannabis* family *Moraceae*; or

(b) Violation, if the delivery is for no consideration and consists of less than five grams of the dried leaves, stems and flowers of the plant *Cannabis* family *Moraceae*. A violation under this paragraph is a specific fine violation. The presumptive fine for a violation under this paragraph is \$650.

(4) Notwithstanding subsections (2) and (3) of this section, unlawful delivery of marijuana is a:

(a) Class A felony, if the delivery is to a person under 18 years of age and the defendant is at least 18 years of age and is at least three years older than the person to whom the marijuana is delivered; or

(b) Class C misdemeanor, if the delivery:

(A) Is for no consideration;

(B) Consists of less than five grams of the dried leaves, stems and flowers of the plant *Cannabis* family *Moraceae*;

(C) Takes place in a public place, as defined in ORS 161.015,

that is within 1,000 feet of the real property comprising a public or private elementary, secondary or career school attended primarily by minors; and

(D) Is to a person who is 18 years of age or older.

SECTION 79. ORS 475.864, as amended by section 2, chapter 591, Oregon Laws 2013, is amended to read:

475.864 Unlawful possession of marijuana. (1) As used in subsections (2) to (4) of this section:

(a) "Marijuana" means the leaves, stems, and flowers of the plant Cannabis family Moraceae.

(b) "Marijuana product" has the meaning given the term "marijuana" in ORS 475.005 (16), but does not include the leaves, stems and flowers of the plant Cannabis family Moraceae.

(2) It is unlawful for any person **under 21 years of age** knowingly or intentionally to possess marijuana or marijuana product.

(3)(a) Unlawful possession of four avoirdupois ounces or more of marijuana **by a person under 21 years of age** is a Class C felony.

(b) Unlawful possession of one avoirdupois ounce of marijuana or more, but less than four avoirdupois ounces, **by a person under 21 years of age** is a Class B misdemeanor.

(c) Unlawful possession of less than one avoirdupois ounce of marijuana **by a person under 21 years of age** is a specific fine violation. The presumptive fine for a violation under this paragraph is \$650.

(4)(a) Unlawful possession of one-quarter avoirdupois ounce or more of marijuana product **by a person under 21 years of age** is a Class C felony.

(b) Unlawful possession of less than one-quarter avoirdupois ounce of marijuana product **by a person under 21 years of age** is a Class B misdemeanor.

(5) As used in subsections (6) to (8) of this section, the terms "licensee," "licensee representative," "marijuana," "marijuana extracts," "marijuana products," "marijuana retailer," "public place," and "usable marijuana" have the meanings given to them in section 5 of this Act.

(6) Except for licensees and licensee representatives, it is unlawful for any person 21 years of age or older knowingly or intentionally to possess:

(a) More than one ounce of usable marijuana in a public place.

(b) More than eight ounces of usable marijuana.

(c) More than sixteen ounces of marijuana products in solid form.

(d) More than seventy-two ounces of marijuana products in liquid form.

(e) More than one ounce of marijuana extracts.

(f) Any marijuana extracts that were not purchased from a licensed marijuana retailer.

(7) A violation of paragraphs (a) to (e) of subsection (6) of this section is a:

(a) Class C felony, if the amount possessed is more than four times the applicable maximum amount specified in subsection (6) of this section;

(b) Class B misdemeanor, if the amount possessed is more than two times, but not more than four times, the applicable maximum amount specified in subsection (6) of this section; or

(c) Class B violation, if the amount possessed is not more than two times the applicable maximum amount specified in subsection (6) of this section.

(8) A violation of paragraph (f) of subsection (6) of this section is a:

(a) Class C felony, if the amount possessed is more than one-quarter ounce of such marijuana extracts; or

(b) Class B misdemeanor, if the amount possessed is not more than one-quarter ounce of such marijuana extracts.

SECTION 80. ORS 571.315 is amended to read:

571.315 Revocation or refusal of license or permit; civil penalty. (1) In addition to any other liability or penalty provided by Oregon law, the State Department of Agriculture may revoke or refuse to issue or renew an industrial hemp license or an agricultural hemp seed production permit and may impose a civil penalty for violation of:

(a) A license or permit requirement;

(b) License or permit terms or conditions;

(c) Department rules relating to growing or handling industrial hemp; or

(d) A final order of the department that is specifically directed to the grower's or handler's industrial hemp operations or activities.

(2) The department may not impose a civil penalty under this section that exceeds \$2,500. The department shall impose civil penalties under this section in the manner provided by ORS 183.745.

(3) The department may revoke or refuse to issue or renew an industrial hemp license or an agricultural hemp seed production permit for violation of any rule of the department that pertains to agricultural operations or activities other than industrial hemp growing or handling.

(4) A revocation of, or a refusal to issue or renew, an industrial hemp license or an agricultural hemp seed production permit is subject to ORS chapter 183.

(5) The department may not revoke or refuse to issue or renew an industrial hemp license or an agricultural hemp seed production permit on the basis that industrial hemp production or possession, or commerce in industrial hemp commodities or products, is prohibited by federal law.

SECTION 81. Sections 71 to 73 of this Act and the amendments to ORS 316.680, 475.525, 475.752, 475.856, 475.860, 475.864, and 571.315 by sections 74 to 80 of this Act apply to conduct occurring on and after the operative date specified in subsection (1) of section 82 of this Act.

SECTION 82. (1) Sections 3 to 73 of this Act and the amendments to ORS 316.680, 475.525, 475.752, 475.856, 475.860, 475.864, and 571.315 by sections 74 to 80 of this Act become operative on July 1, 2015.

(2) The Oregon Liquor Control Commission may take any action before the operative date specified in subsection (1) of this section that is necessary to enable the commission to exercise, on and after the operative date specified in subsection (1) of this section, all the duties, functions and powers conferred on the commission by sections 3 to 73 of this Act and the amendments to ORS 316.680, 475.525, 475.752, 475.856, 475.860, 475.864, and 571.315 by sections 74 to 80 of this Act.

SECTION 83. The section captions used in this Act are provided only for the convenience of the reader and do not become part of the statutory law of this state or express any legislative intent in the enactment of this Act.

SECTION 84. This Act becomes effective 30 days after the day on which it is approved by a majority of the votes cast on it.

SECTION 85. If an initiative petition that conflicts with this Act is placed on the ballot at the next regular general election held throughout this state on November 4, 2014, and if both this Act and the conflicting initiative petition are approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon, the conflicting initiative petition is repealed in its entirety if this Act receives a number of affirmative votes greater than the number of affirmative votes received by the conflicting initiative petition.

SECTION 86. If any sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, or words of this Act (including but not limited to the entirety of sections 7 to 70 of this Act) shall be held unconstitutional, void, or illegal, either on their face or as applied, this shall not affect the applicability, constitutionality, or legality of any other sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, and words of this Act. To that end, the sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, and words of this Act are intended to be severable. It is hereby declared to be the intent of this Act that this Act would have been adopted had such unconstitutional, void, or illegal sections, subsections, paragraphs, phrases, or words, if any, not been included in this Act.

Note: **Boldfaced** type indicates new language; *[brackets and italic]* type indicates deletions or comments.

Explanatory Statement

Current Oregon law prohibits the cultivation, use and distribution of marijuana, except as permitted by the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act.

Ballot Measure 91 legalizes personal possession of marijuana within specified limits, and provides for a commercial regulatory system of marijuana production, distribution and sale.

As to personal possession, the measure allows a person 21 years of age or older to have, at any given time, up to 1 ounce of marijuana away from home so long as it is out of public view. At home, per household, persons 21 years of age or older may possess 8 ounces of marijuana, 16 ounces of marijuana products, 72 ounces of marijuana in liquid form, and 1 ounce of marijuana extracts. The measure also allows a household to have up to 4 marijuana plants, which cannot be grown in public view.

The measure prohibits using marijuana in a public place, or using marijuana while driving a vehicle on a public road. This measure also prohibits homemade marijuana extracts, or providing marijuana to a person who is visibly intoxicated.

As to the commercial regulatory system, the measure provides for the licensing and regulation of the production, processing, wholesale, and retail sale of marijuana and marijuana products throughout the state. The Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) must adopt rules regulating those activities by January 1, 2016. The OLCC must begin taking license applications not later than January 4, 2016, and begin issuing licenses soon after that. A person must be at least 21 years of age to obtain an OLCC license, purchase marijuana from a retailer, or work at any licensed marijuana business. Licenses can be denied or revoked for violation of this measure or OLCC rules. The State of Oregon will not operate any of these marijuana businesses.

A city or county may adopt reasonable time, place and manner regulations of the nuisance aspects of licensed retail activities. A city or county may opt out of having marijuana businesses only by petition signed by 10 percent of registered voters and approved by a majority of voters at a general election.

The measure imposes a tax, by weight, on marijuana produced by licensees. Local taxation is prohibited. The OLCC will also collect licensee fees. Money collected by the state tax and licensee fees is used to fund licensing and regulation by the state. Remaining revenue will be distributed as follows: 40 percent to help fund schools, 25 percent for substance abuse treatment and prevention services, 15 percent to the state police, and 20 percent to cities and counties solely for enforcement of this measure.

The measure requires the Oregon Department of Agriculture to issue hemp licenses to qualified farmers.

The measure does not affect state laws relating to medical marijuana, landlord-tenant matters, penalties for driving under the influence of intoxicants, marijuana laws applying to those under 21 years of age, any federal government grant or contract requirements, or state or federal law pertaining to employment matters.

Committee Members:

Anthony Johnson*
Becky Straus
Rob Bovett
Josh Marquis*
Hardy Myers

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioners
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

*Member dissents (does not concur with explanatory statement)

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Argument in Favor

**I'm a grandmother.
I don't want my grandchildren using marijuana.
I'm voting YES on Measure 91.**

As a grandmother, my greatest concern is always the health and safety of my grandchildren. That's why their parents and I have talked with them about how people under 21 should not use marijuana. But I also know that it is easier for kids to get marijuana than a six-pack. Trying to control marijuana through the criminal justice system doesn't work.

I would much rather see a system of strict regulation and control, much like we have for alcohol. Taking marijuana production, sales and use out of the criminal market gives us a much better chance of keeping it out of the hands of kids. Drug dealers don't ask for ID.

As for adults using marijuana – I feel that is a choice each individual must make. But people 21 and older should not see their lives ruined just because they used marijuana. Under our current laws, a 22-year-old student who has a small amount of marijuana on them could be arrested, put in jail, lose their loans, be forced to drop out of school and then have a record that follows them every time they try to get a job or housing. **Our current laws go too far.**

Measure 91 has the right restrictions in place, more than any measure ever put before Oregon voters.

- Marijuana will be strictly controlled from seed to sale.
- Marijuana can only be sold in licensed, inspected and audited stores in specially zoned areas that are far away from schools.
- Sellers must ask for IDs. People under 21 are forbidden from even entering the stores.
- The new law will penalize access by minors, keep current laws against driving while impaired, keep drug-free workplace rules and prevent public use.

Our current system isn't working. Let's replace it with one that does.

Vote YES on Measure 91.

Martha Duff, Portland

(This information furnished by Martha Duff, Portland.)

Argument in Favor

**An important message from:
Kris Olson
Former Chief Federal Prosecutor for Oregon**

For 17 years I served as a federal prosecutor, including 7 years as the U.S Attorney for Oregon. As chief federal prosecutor, I led the prosecution of all federal drug cases in this state. I did my utmost to pursue justice and keep Oregonians safe.

I learned firsthand how our current approach to marijuana has failed. By keeping marijuana illegal, we enrich organized crime and violent drug cartels. At the same time, we distract police, who spend too much time arresting and citing people for small amounts of marijuana.

In the last decade, police in Oregon arrested or cited almost 100,000 people for marijuana violations. People of color are cited or arrested at more than twice the rate of whites, despite no difference in the rate of use of marijuana between races. Even if each arrest or citation took only 10 minutes, that's nearly one million minutes. One million minutes is the equivalent of two years.

Every minute police and sheriffs spend on a low-level marijuana case is time taken away from a case that truly affects public safety.

Yet, police have no choice but to go after marijuana users. Enforcing the law is their job. That's why the law must change. Our country has spent more than 40 years and

\$1 trillion fighting the War on Drugs. When it comes to marijuana, the numbers make it clear it's not working.

Measure 91 is a better way forward for Oregon. Police will have more time to focus on violent offenses. Money spent on legal marijuana will be diverted from the black market and drug cartels. Instead, it will go into legitimate businesses, and the taxes generated will go to essential public services like police, mental health and drug prevention. Plus, Measure 91's strict regulations provide the protections we need.

Let's improve our marijuana laws, the right way.

Vote YES on Measure 91.

(This information furnished by Kris Olson.)

Argument in Favor

**Teachers and School Volunteers Say:
To Better Protect Young People,
We Need a New Approach to Marijuana**

As teachers and school volunteers, we believe that marijuana isn't a substance that should be used by young people. Yet, based on what we've seen in our schools, it's clear that our current marijuana laws fail when it comes to protecting our students.

Right now, kids have an easier time getting marijuana than they should. **In fact, current marijuana policy increases the risk to young people because black market sellers do nothing to avoid selling to youth.** They don't provide drug education and they don't ask for ID.

We need to end the system that gives criminals and drug cartels control over whether and which kids have access to marijuana. We can take better care of our kids by passing Measure 91 which will strictly regulate and control marijuana.

Measure 91 also will provide desperately-needed funding for proven drug education and prevention strategies for youth, along with treatment and support for those who need it. Right now, these programs are underfunded and not making it into classrooms and community centers where they are needed.

Taxes from marijuana will be put into a special account that, by law, is distributed as follows: 25% to fund drug prevention and treatment programs, 40% to Oregon's public schools, and 35% to state and local police.

Voting Yes on 91 means:

- Better control of marijuana and drastically reducing the black market.
- Better, proven tools to keep kids away from marijuana.
- Better funding for prevention, treatment and schools.

Regardless of how we feel about marijuana, we should all agree that it's crucial to protect kids.

Bobbie Regan, school volunteer, Portland

Ginny Markell, retired high school teacher, North Clackamas

Elizabeth Kaufman, former high school teacher, Clackamas County

Michael Schwab, After School Program Leader, Eugene

Christopher D. Hebbe, paraeducator, Portland

Timothy Rake, retired 4J teacher, Eugene

(This information furnished by Christopher Hebbe.)

Argument in Favor

"The examination room is a sanctuary...the war on drugs does not belong there."

--Richard Bayer, M.D., FACP

I have seen many patients benefit from the use of medical marijuana, before and after I was co-chief petitioner of the

Oregon Medical Marijuana Act, when it successfully passed in 1998.

I support Measure 91 because it doesn't negatively impact the Oregon Medical Marijuana Program and can benefit many patients not covered or served by the medical law. Marijuana regulation is a better policy than marijuana prohibition.

Measure 91 does not impact the Oregon Medical Marijuana Act in any way.

Understandably, I am very protective of Oregon's medical marijuana program and its patients and would not support anything that would do the medical program or its patients any harm. I can wholeheartedly support Measure 91 because it protects the program and our patients.

Medical marijuana laws are not enough for many patients. Because of local bans, too many patients have to travel long distances to acquire medical marijuana - or go without. Too many patients can't afford to pay for a state registration fee and the doctor visits necessary to acquire a medical marijuana card. Low-income patients shouldn't be subjected to criminal laws because of poverty. Additionally, there is still too much discrimination against medical marijuana patients and medical marijuana research. Measure 91 will put us on a path to end that discrimination and start the serious study of medical marijuana in Oregon.

Regulation works better than marijuana prohibition. Just as Al Capone and other mobsters profited from alcohol prohibition, drug cartels profit from marijuana prohibition today, endangering too many people. Measure 91 brings marijuana out of an unregulated market into a regulated market with the right restrictions, and creates new tax revenue for drug treatment and drug prevention programs. We have had great success decreasing teen use of tobacco with regulation, taxation, and education and we can do the same with marijuana.

Richard Bayer, M.D., FACP

(This information furnished by Dr. Richard E Bayer, M.D. FACP.)

Argument in Favor

City Club of Portland Recommends a Yes Vote

Legalize, License, and Tax

What does this measure do?

This well-written measure uses our current state agency infrastructure and provides a detailed method for licensing, taxation, and regulation of marijuana. Revenues after program costs are distributed to schools, law enforcement, mental health, alcohol and drug services, and other health services.

Why has this been proposed?

Current marijuana laws unnecessarily limit adult Oregonians' freedom to consume a product that is less addictive than legal products such as alcohol and tobacco.

Our current system is ineffective at achieving its goal of limiting marijuana use to legitimate medical purposes.

Why vote yes?

- Oregonians will have increased personal freedom.
- Crime can be reduced through well-regulated legalization.
- Legalization will bring in additional revenue for crucial public services such as public safety, public health, and education.
- Consumption can be discouraged through education and advertising with provided tax revenues.
- Economic opportunity will increase through added revenue and job growth.
- Brings existing jobs into the legal marketplace, decriminalizes them, and makes them subject to laws regarding workplace safety, Social Security, income tax withholding, and legal protections for workers.

City Club Members Vote:

Yes 83%

No 17%

Who is City Club of Portland?

We bring together civic-minded people to make Portland and Oregon better places to live, work and play for everyone. Read our complete recommendation and become a City Club member at:

www.pdxcityclub.org

(This information furnished by Karen Kervin, President, City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Favor

Former Volunteer Firefighter and Emergency Medical Technician says:

A regulated approach will more safely control marijuana.

The jobs of EMTs and firefighters are already treacherous enough. Illegal marijuana growing can make our job even tougher. That's why we need a safer approach to controlling marijuana and why I am voting Yes on Measure 91.

A regulated approach to marijuana will cut down on illegal growing so that firefighters are safer.

You may know about illegal marijuana growing in our forests. **But illegal growing operations also make our neighborhoods more dangerous.** Illicit growers go to great lengths to hide their electricity consumption, including stealing electricity from others using dangerous homemade power lines that can easily catch fire. They set up in quiet neighborhoods like yours and mine so they don't attract attention.

Measure 91 creates a system of legitimate businesses that would be treated like other businesses. They would:

- pay for proper electricity and professional installation;
- install sprinklers and adhere to fire code; and
- meet zoning standards and be located where they belong, not hidden away.

Illegal growing operations make the outdoors more dangerous.

In training for wildland fires, we are warned of the dangers from large illegal growing in wildfire-infested areas. Because these operations are illegal, they are often protected by booby-traps or arms, and firefighters are instructed to get away from them - even if it means walking away from a fire that needs our attention.

Measure 91 fights back against drug cartels so that they face competition with the regulated market and go out of business.

Let's make our neighborhoods and wildlands safer by regulating, legalizing, and taxing marijuana. I'm a former EMT and volunteer firefighter, and I'm voting Yes on 91.

Brad Stewart, Nehalem

(This information furnished by Bradley G Stewart.)

Argument in Favor

We See the Human Cost and Ruined Lives Caused by Our Current Marijuana Laws Every Day

Please vote Yes on Measure 91 because treating marijuana use as a crime has failed.

- Arresting and citing thousands for marijuana every year is a drain upon law enforcement and judicial resources and has failed to increase public safety or deter use.
- It unnecessarily harms people's lives.
- Marijuana laws have disproportionately harmed people of color and hurt low-income citizens the most.

Violation of marijuana laws can tear families apart and deny people education, employment and housing opportunities. Many of us see first-hand the harm caused by an irrational policy. We are advocating against our own financial interests, but we cannot remain silent in the face of such a discriminatory and harmful policy.

Measure 91 would license and regulate marijuana only for adults over the age of 21, very similarly to how we regulate beer and wine. Driving under the influence laws will remain in place. It remains against the law to provide marijuana to minors.

Taking marijuana out of the unregulated, illicit market and into a legal, regulated market will allow law enforcement resources to be better prioritized to fight serious and violent crime.

We urge you to vote Yes on Measure 91 to better prioritize local and state police resources and allow Oregon police officers to concentrate on more important matters.

Leland R. Berger

Claudia E. Browne

Thomas K. Coan, Attorney at Law

Emerge Law Group

Robert A. Graham, Attorney at Law

Kohel Haver, Partner of SWIDER HAVER LLP

John Henry Hingson III, Attorney at Law

Paul T. Loney, Attorney at Law

John Lucy IV, Attorney at Law

Brian Michaels, P.C., Attorney at Law

Jonah Morningstar, Attorney at Law/Owner,
Morningstar Legal Arts

Courtney N. Moran, LL.M.

Michael E. Rose, Creighton & Rose, PC

Bradley M. Steinman, Attorney at Law

Philip W. Studenberg, Attorney at Law

Bear Wilner-Nugent

Neal Weingart, Attorney at Law, LLC

Ann B. Witte, Attorney

(This information furnished by Leland R Berger, Attorney at Law, Oregon CannaBusiness Compliance Counsel, LLC.)

Argument in Favor

Retired Oregon Supreme Court Justice William Riggs: Vote Yes on Measure 91

For more than 35 years I've served Oregon as a trial judge, a Judge on the Oregon Court of Appeals and as a Justice on the Oregon Supreme Court. From that perspective, I can tell you it's time for a better approach to marijuana in our state.

Marijuana legalization is inevitable. I believe we need to do it with the most responsible approach possible. In fact, I voted against the marijuana legalization measure two years ago because I thought it was a flawed proposal. But I am voting Yes on 91. I've reviewed countless laws in my career and I have carefully read this proposal.

Measure 91 is carefully written to legalize, regulate and tax marijuana for adults 21 and older, and it's the right way forward for our state.

Treating marijuana use as a crime has failed and has repercussions far beyond Oregon.

Violent drug cartels in Mexico are driving a humanitarian crisis at our borders. The violence is due, in part, to illegal marijuana exports to the black market here. We can cut off the unlawful drug trafficking with a smart approach at home. Marijuana is an economic engine that fuels some gangs. This measure will move the money that funds gangs into the regulated, legitimate economy.

I can also tell you marijuana prohibition has bogged down our justice system. Last year, 13,408 people were arrested or cited for marijuana crimes in Oregon. That's one person every 39 minutes, all of whom go through the justice system. In the last decade, more than 99,000 people have been arrested or cited for marijuana. That's roughly the same as arresting or citing every person who lives in Albany and Tigard.

This November, Measure 91 is our chance to get it right. **That's why I'll be voting yes.**

I hope my fellow Oregonians will read the measure, give it careful thought and join me.

(This information furnished by Richard William Riggs, Retired Justice Oregon Supreme Court.)

Argument in Favor

A Message from Reverend David Bean, Elder United Methodist Church

As a leader in the faith community and as a minister, I'm commanded to teach and work for peace. In turn, I guide others to support humane public policies because that is what my faith instructs me to do.

Our current harsh marijuana laws are not the right thing to do. The FBI Uniform Crime Statistics estimate that fully 7% of arrests in Oregon each year are for simple marijuana possession. Beyond the fact that it isn't a good use of police resources, I see the human cost of that policy. It can ruin people's lives by giving them a criminal record that stays with them when trying to get a job, housing or a loan. And today's laws aren't preventing young people from getting marijuana.

The 12,000 annual marijuana arrests and citations in Oregon are not just numbers, they are people. There are very few of us who do not know somebody who uses marijuana, or has used it for some purpose. For adults, that is their choice to make. And if we want to protect young people from marijuana, Measure 91 offers a smarter and more effective way to do it.

Marijuana is here, and it's not going away. A better system would allow responsible adults to use it sensibly without penalty. A better system will strictly regulate marijuana to protect young people and the vulnerable. A better system would redirect police time and money to address more violent crime, including taking on the drug cartels currently in the marijuana business. A better system will tax marijuana and use the funds for drug education and prevention programs.

As a person of faith, I'm voting Yes for Measure 91 because it's the right thing to do. For our communities, for our families, and for our humanity.

(This information furnished by Rev. Dave Bean.)

Argument in Favor

Protect Rural Oregon With Measure 91: Get rid of violent drug cartel grow operations and create agriculture jobs.

Our beautiful, wide-open land drew pioneers to Oregon. Now many of our rural lands have attracted something far worse. Foreign drug cartels are farming marijuana on pristine land in our counties, taking advantage of our cash-strapped law enforcement to feed their black market operations.

Let's vote to regulate, legalize and tax marijuana to cut off the black market and send the cartels packing. Rural Oregon has so much good, we don't want to be known as ground zero for drug gang activity.

These illegal grows are a scourge:

- Thugs with guns roam remote areas; any family out camping could suddenly land in danger.
- Chemicals are used without regard for safety or how they might contaminate our water.
- Forest land is booby-trapped to protect illicit fields.

Measure 91 taxes legal marijuana. Instead of dumping money in a big bank account for Salem, it's written into the law that **the money will be spent on schools, law enforcement, and drug treatment and education.** Our sheriffs' offices will get money to help bring back 24-hours service so when we call 911, someone is there to help. Our jail beds will be reserved to keep dangerous criminals off our streets instead of jailing non-violent marijuana users.

Most of us know someone who needs a job. Growing marijuana and hemp is an industry waiting in the wings right now. Beyond farming there's manufacturing. Hemp can be made into more than 20,000 products. We have a real pioneering spirit here in Oregon, let's put it to use.

Tolerating violent drug cartels in our midst is making our communities less safe. **We can end the black market for marijuana and create jobs for hard-working people in rural Oregon.** Let's boost funding for our kids' schools and bring back our public safety officers. Vote Yes on 91 for the good of all Oregonians.

(This information furnished by Dan Mahr, Campaign Manager, Vote Yes on 91.)

Argument in Favor

The Oregon State Council for Retired Citizens is Oregon's oldest grassroots senior advocacy organization. It represents the state's retired residents on issues relevant to aging and quality of life for senior citizens.

The Council for Retired Citizens urges everyone to support Measure 91 to regulate, legalize and tax marijuana in Oregon.

For older Americans, marijuana can and does provide great relief for many conditions. However, when one is sick and in need of effective medicine, it can be difficult to get a medical marijuana card. And even if you can get a card, it's often hard to get marijuana through legal means due to bans on dispensaries across much of the state.

Consider this example: a local older couple became desperate to obtain marijuana to ease the side effects of the wife's cancer treatment. First, their primary care doctor refused to fill a prescription for medical marijuana. Then they were unable to get a referral to a doctor who would do so. Finally they had to resort to the black market so she could get some relief.

The lack of legal marijuana means that medical providers are nervous about having anything to do with it. Medical institutions aren't conducting research to understand the course of treatment for marijuana. And there is no funding for clinical trials because it is still largely illegal.

This is the first time a senior citizens organization in Oregon has endorsed a marijuana regulation measure. That reflects the fact that Measure 91 is a serious, well-crafted and better approach.

In addition to controlling the growing, selling and distribution of marijuana, Measure 91 will:

- Better protect youth by putting black market drug dealers out of business;
- Improve access and information for the elderly and persons with disabilities who need medical marijuana;
- Redirect police resources away from policing "marijuana criminals" to serious crime; and

- Generate tax revenue to enhance education, public safety, and drug treatment and prevention programs.

Vote Yes on Measure 91

(This information furnished by Steve Weiss, Oregon State Council for Retired Citizens.)

Argument in Favor

It is long past time for Oregon to end the prohibition on marijuana.

In 1973, Oregon decriminalized marijuana possession. Opponents predicted all manner of dire consequences. They were never realized.

In 1998, our state regulated medical marijuana cultivation and possession. Again, opponents predicted harm would come to our children, roadways, and workplaces. The harms never materialized.

Prohibition never works. In the 1920s, anyone who wanted a drink could get one. Gangs distributed booze and ran speak-easies. Organized crime was rampant; people got shot in the streets.

Today, one in nine Oregon adults is consuming marijuana grown and sold by cartels, criminals, and kids.

We can end Prohibition again by voting for the responsible marijuana regulations proposed by Measure 91.

Prohibition means asset forfeiture and federal anti-drug "Byrne Grants", have become a funding source for law enforcement and drug rehabilitation businesses. By removing marijuana from the workload of cops and courts, we free up more time and money to combat actual crime.

Measure 91 will give police 35% and drug treatment 25% of its revenues. The remaining 40% will go to our schools. Estimates of revenues from Oregon's marijuana market vary, but whatever the actual figure is, it will be infinitely more revenue than we collect on marijuana now.

While benefitting schools financially, Measure 91 also benefits kids by placing the marijuana market in secure, adults-only stores where IDs are checked. In Colorado, they've found this practice reduced regular teen marijuana use rates even as national rates increased. Colorado teens also have more difficulty getting marijuana than the national average. Regulation works!

Measure 91 maintains our strict drugged driving standards that have contributed to our safest traffic statistics even while having over 64,000 medical marijuana patients. Freeways in Colorado and Washington are the safest ever as well, with fatality rates far below national averages.

Say no to criminals running the marijuana market, spoiling our national forests, and selling to our kids. Vote Yes on Measure 91.

(This information furnished by John R Belville, Executive Director.)

Argument in Favor

Sheriff.

County Executive.

5th Generation Oregonian.

Supporter of Measure 91.

I have spent a considerable part of my life associated with law enforcement and government and I have come to the conclusion that "The Drug War" has not only been lost; but like most wars, its consequences have been a disaster. I have also had my belief confirmed that prohibition of a commonly engaged-in practice like marijuana use, does far more harm than good.

I have worked as a prison guard, deputy sheriff, elected sheriff, assistant professor of criminal justice, county commissioner, county chairman, county executive, founder of Hooper DeTox Center, and Housing Authority executive director.

My conclusion from this experience is that while many things may not be good for us, they should not necessarily be unlawful.

Prohibition creates a black market to meet the demand for the prohibited item. The black market is run by criminals who gain great profits that are used to corrupt the system. A gangster class is created that is very hard to eradicate.

On the other hand, the quality and safety of the product is best assured when it is tightly controlled and available through a government-regulated system with profit going to public health, treatment and education.

Measure 91 moves Oregon to a more rational model for controlling a product for which there is an obvious demand. This measure will not solve all of the problems associated with its use, but it will be more humane, less corruptive and more transparent.

I plan to vote yes.

Donald E. Clark, former Sheriff

Multnomah County

(This information furnished by Don Clark.)

Argument in Favor

The Reality of Legalizing Marijuana: A Letter from a Colorado Mom

When my state voted to be first in the nation to legalize and regulate marijuana for adults over 21, many people didn't know what to expect. As a mother of a teenage boy, I was among them. There were plenty of scare tactics from opponents to the measure -- in Oregon you are probably hearing the same thing.

Here is the reality: **Life is pretty much the same after marijuana legalization. And the law is working well.**

The most frightening picture painted by opponents was that there would be drugged drivers all over the highways. That's definitely not the case. In fact, deadly crashes on Colorado roads are down since legal marijuana went on sale.

The police are taking the law's protection of our kids very seriously. In undercover checks at marijuana stores statewide, 100% refused to sell to minors. **Unlike drug dealers who never ask for I.D., these legitimate businesses have a lot to lose.** There is even a statewide ad campaign warning teenagers not to take a chance with their developing brains by trying marijuana under age.

Opponents said there would be more crime. Since regulated marijuana went on sale, violent crime, robberies and burglaries are all down in Denver.

And in just the first five months of legal sales, Colorado earned \$23.6 million in taxes, licensing and fees on marijuana. That's money previously being funneled to drug cartels. Now it will pay for schools, treatment and law enforcement.

And people would be smoking marijuana in the streets? **The law doesn't allow it.**

I can tell you that here in Colorado, life keeps going as normal. **There is more personal freedom with the added bonus of more money for vital services.**

Turns out I'm glad I voted yes for marijuana in Colorado, and I'd urge you to vote yes on Measure 91.

Lily Marsh - Denver, CO

(This information furnished by Lily Marsh.)

Argument in Favor

WHY DO NURSES URGE A YES VOTE FOR MEASURE 91?

*Urgent research needed for medical marijuana.
Schools need drug education, not drug dealers.
Mental health treatment needs funding.*

As nurses we have firsthand experience with how people use marijuana. There is no question the current approach of treating it as a crime has failed. With Measure 91, Oregon has a better way forward.

PROBLEM: Medical marijuana transforms lives, but almost no research can be done on it. For patients with diseases like multiple sclerosis or cancer, medical marijuana can be the difference between a bearable and unbearable life. But because marijuana is illegal, there's no effective system for labeling, testing and dosing. Medical studies are nearly impossible to conduct. Patients and doctors must rely on guesswork.

SOLUTION: Make marijuana legal so that medical research can be done and doctors and patients can get basic information.

PROBLEM: Schools need drug education, not drug dealers. Right now, people who buy marijuana are giving money to drug cartels and black market dealers. These dealers sell marijuana to children, making it too easy for kids to get. And they are the ones who "educate" kids about marijuana.

SOLUTION: Tax marijuana so the money goes to drug prevention, not to drug dealers and cartels. Children are more likely to say no to marijuana when they get proven drug education. With tobacco, regulation, taxation and education has been effective in reducing use.

PROBLEM: Mental health is woefully underfunded. We're throwing people who need mental health treatment into jails and turning them into hardened criminals.

SOLUTION: Tax marijuana so money goes to mental health treatment. It's cheaper and less cruel than addressing mental health problems by putting people behind bars.

Rachel Seidelman, Registered Nurse - Portland	Pat Hughes, RNC BSN - Portland
Mark Jacklin, RN - Grants Pass	Rosemary J. Piser, MS HL&A - Eugene
Mary Ellen Ashmore, retired nurse - Eugene	Davi Hawk, RN - Grants Pass
Maggi O'Brien, RN - Roseburg	

(This information furnished by Pat E. Hughes, RNC, BSN.)

Argument in Favor

Vote Yes on Measure 91: A Veteran's View

I am proud to have served my country as a Specialist in the Army. One of the reasons that I joined the military was to preserve the American ideals of freedom and individual rights.

But those freedoms are not the main reason I am asking you to join me in voting Yes on Measure 91, which will regulate, legalize and tax the adult use of marijuana in Oregon.

The main reason I am asking you to vote yes is what I've seen since.

Many of us who served our country - especially in the Iraq and Afghanistan era - came home with challenges. Some are physical. Some are mental and emotional. I was lucky. Too many of my brothers and sisters were not. And as we have

seen repeatedly and heartbreakingly in the media, the resources to provide the help they need just aren't there.

Measure 91 will do more than end the failed policy of treating the use of marijuana as a crime, which wastes millions of dollars and ruins thousands of lives. It will provide urgently needed funding for mental health services – including those that our veterans desperately need and cannot access.

Tax revenue generated by Measure 91 will also provide funds for our schools, state and local law enforcement and proven youth prevention programs. It's the right thing to do.

But I wanted to make sure my fellow Oregonians knew that their Yes vote is also a way to stand up for those who stood up for all of us – and often at a great cost.

Sincerely,

Specialist Austin Johnson, US Army

(This information furnished by Austin Johnson.)

Argument in Favor

The current approach to marijuana is hurting our environment.

There are many reasons why we need a new approach to marijuana in Oregon. It's a waste of money and resources to lock up non-violent marijuana users. A legal, regulated system with taxes on marijuana will fund vital state services.

Another positive impact of marijuana regulation is that it will better protect our wilderness, parklands, farmland and forests.

Criminal growers with links to drug cartels hide their illegal operations on public lands. They don't care how much damage is done to fragile habitats in national parks, state parks and wilderness areas.

Growing unregulated marijuana in natural areas destroys local ecosystems, by:

- Destroying native, fragile plant life and habitat; and
- Illegally diverting water from streams and creeks for irrigation, which in turn dries out water sources for fish and plants.

Indoor illegal marijuana growing can use a tremendous amount of energy. Some don't follow the fire code or have access to energy conservation techniques or equipment. They won't ask for help with solar panels and power-saving equipment, and have no incentive to do so.

Measure 91 will help reverse these unintended consequences.

Most importantly, a legal market will help drive criminal market cartel growers out of business. Marijuana will be grown by licensed individuals with no need to hide in our forests. There will be less need for resource-heavy indoor grows. Those who grow indoors can do so with the help of energy-saving equipment and conservation measures.

This November, we'll be voting to regulate, legalize and tax marijuana. One of the reasons we're voting 'yes' is to better protect our environment.

David Meyers, Medford Celine Swenson-Harris, Eugene

Sandra Pettigrew, Ashland Tara Sulzen, Portland

(This information furnished by Tara Sulzen.)

Argument in Favor

Oregon's Former Top Drug Treatment and Addictions Official Asks You to Vote YES on 91
by Richard Harris

I've served as a drug addiction and treatment expert for over 30 years, with thousands of clients at local recovery

organizations and as Director of Oregon's Addictions and Mental Health Service Division.

My experience—and the perspective of addressing drug abuse and treatment—convince me that criminalizing marijuana use has failed. It is the wrong approach for the wrong substance.

First, recreational marijuana use by responsible adults is relatively benign, and medicinal use of marijuana has benefitted many people. Like alcohol, it should be regulated and taxed, not prohibited.

Second, criminalizing marijuana is a bad use of public safety time and money. Giving marijuana users a criminal record devastates families and lives. A better approach is to tax marijuana and use the funds to provide treatment on demand for those who experience addictions and dependencies. In my experience, properly funded treatment works.

That's why I support Measure 91.

Measure 91 can generate tax money that, by law, goes to drug treatment, abuse prevention, schools, and public safety, which are seriously underfunded in Oregon. This lack of funding is a shame—we know that treatment and prevention can be effective when they have adequate support.

The bottom line: there are two different approaches to drugs like alcohol and marijuana -criminalization, or a public health model.

Criminalization leads to stigma, unemployment, and ruined lives.

The public health approach leads to education, prevention, treatment, and a successful future.

We have seen this work in Oregon when public intoxication was decriminalized in the 1970s and detoxification and treatment were substituted for jail. When public intoxication was illegal, all we had was a public safety response. Decriminalization opened up a more successful public health response. We can have similar success by decriminalizing marijuana use and creating a regulated system.

Let's take the better approach.

Please join me by voting Yes on 91.

(This information furnished by Richard Harris.)

Argument in Favor

Measure 91 Is An Important Opportunity for Oregon Farmers

Oregon farmers know that our state's prohibition of marijuana has unintended consequences that many people don't know about. One example: our senseless approach that prohibits the growth of hemp as an agricultural crop.

You can legally buy hemp cereal at the grocery store in Oregon. But as farmers, we can't grow it. Why? Hemp is considered off limits due to its relationship to marijuana plants.

But hemp is not a drug. Smoking it will not get you high. It will only get you sick.

Instead, hemp is a fibrous plant with many, many household uses. When processed, hemp can be used as fuel, wax, rope, resin, cloth, paper, pulp and food.

Canadians make half a billion dollars a year in the hemp market, and about 90% of the hemp they grow is exported to the United States. Oregonians shouldn't be forced to buy hemp from overseas, when Oregon farmers could be growing this sustainable, environmentally-friendly cash crop right here.

Hemp is well-matched for Oregon's climate and soil. It can be grown on flatland or on slopes, requires only a reasonable level of irrigation, and is resilient against pests.

We can change our approach to hemp, by passing Measure 91.

Measure 91 includes language that removes barriers for qualified farmers to apply for hemp production licenses under state law.

There is an entire hemp industry sitting on the sidelines waiting for voters to pass this law. In addition to being a golden opportunity for Oregon farmers, the processing and manufacturing of raw hemp will create jobs across the state.

I've spent my career in the nursery industry and have spoken with many farmers about the issue of hemp prohibition. They all agree - farmers need the option to grow industrial hemp in Oregon.

Please join me in voting YES on Measure 91

Ryan Basile - Silverton, OR

(This information furnished by Ryan Basile.)

Argument in Favor

Why Vote Yes on Measure 91? THE BOTTOM LINE

There are many reasons to vote for Measure 91, and many ways to talk about it. But there are some very basic facts that make up the bottom line of why to vote Yes.

Our current marijuana laws simply don't work.

- They cost a fortune.
- They empower and enrich criminals and drug cartels.
- They distract law enforcement from serious crime, with over 99,000 arrests or citations over the last 10 years (one every 39 minutes).
- They don't curb marijuana use.
- They ruin lives.

Tightly regulating and taxing the growth, sale and use of marijuana is a better approach.

- It legalizes marijuana use for adults 21 and older only.
- It provides strong protections against use by youth, including funding for proven, effective education and prevention programs.
- It maintains current driving under the influence laws and drug-free workplace rules.
- Taxing marijuana provides tens of millions of dollars for vitally important needs, with 40% to schools; 35% to state and local law enforcement; and 25% to drug treatment, prevention and mental health programs.
- By law, the money goes into a special account and can only be spent as directed.

What will Oregon look like after Measure 91 passes?

- We will have taken money and power away from the black market and drug cartels.
- We will have provided protections for neighborhoods and kids.
- We will have funded schools, public safety, prevention and mental health.

And Measure 91 was written to take the best lessons from the experiences of Washington and Colorado's laws, making this the right measure at the right time.

That's why 146,708 Oregonians - from east to west and north to south - signed the petition to put this important measure on the ballot.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 91
It's the better approach for Oregon.

(This information furnished by Anthony Johnson, Chief Petitioner, Yes on 91.)

Argument in Favor

The American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon and Partnership for Safety and Justice
Urge you to Vote Yes on Ballot Measure 91

Keeping marijuana illegal and unregulated has resulted in the unnecessary diversion of limited public safety resources.

According to statewide data collected by the Oregon State Police, there have been over 99,000 arrests and citations for marijuana offenses in Oregon over the past decade - the vast majority for simple possession. That means police and sheriffs are pursuing people who use marijuana and not focusing fully on preventing serious or violent crime.

Arrests and citations for marijuana use and purchase exact great personal costs. There are steep fines for possessing even a small amount of marijuana and many marijuana charges carry the threat of long prison terms. For example, under current law, a person who grows even one marijuana plant for their own use could face up to 10 years in prison. Some people are saddled with a criminal record that creates barriers to employment, housing and student loans.

What's more, our current marijuana laws are enforced along color lines and create a significant racial justice issue: even though African Americans and white people in Oregon use marijuana at about the same rate, blacks are twice as likely to be arrested or cited than are whites.

It's time for a new approach, with sensible policies that lift the criminalization of marijuana use for responsible adults - 21 and older - and more sensibly and safely control how marijuana is produced and sold.

- Measure 91 sets up a smart and regulated approach to marijuana that will redirect police and court time to more urgent public safety concerns.
- Measure 91 means that marijuana will be taxed and funds will go to support, among other things, drug prevention programs that currently receive inadequate support.
- Measure 91 supports a more fair criminal justice system.

We urge you to vote Yes on Measure 91.

(This information furnished by Rebecca Straus, American Civil Liberties of Oregon.)

Argument in Favor

A Former Drug Prosecutor Says Measure 91 is the Right Choice for Oregon

As a former prosecutor, I know insufficient resources are causing Oregon's criminal justice system to burst at the seams. Officers are stretched thin. Prosecutors and defense attorneys struggle to handle caseloads, and there aren't enough courtrooms, probation officers or jail space to handle offenders. Drug treatment options are vastly underfunded.

Drug crimes unquestionably contribute a disproportionate burden. *By passing Measure 91 and responsibly legalizing, regulating and taxing marijuana, Oregonians can direct critical resources towards violent crime and drugs such as methamphetamine, heroin and cocaine.*

Measure 91 Creates New Revenue

But Measure 91 does more than just make better use of existing limited resources. It also creates new revenue through taxes and mandates that 35% of all such revenue must go to law enforcement.

Getting Our Priorities Straight

Over the last decade, almost 100,000 Oregonians have been detained for marijuana offenses. Every minute an officer or a judge spends on a marijuana case is time and money away from more serious crime. Recent statistics show Oregon has nearly 150 untested rape kits, more than 50 missing children, and multiple unsolved murders.

Given severely limited resources, law enforcement does a phenomenal job. *But we can be smarter with our resources*

by responsibly legalizing, regulating and taxing marijuana in Oregon.

Doesn't Change DUI Laws

Existing Oregon law forbids driving while under the influence of alcohol or drugs to a noticeable or perceptible degree. Measure 91 does not change Oregon DUI law whatsoever, and that law is sufficient to successfully prosecute anyone who drives while impaired by marijuana.

Support Measure 91

Legalizing, regulating, and taxing marijuana in Oregon through Measure 91 means:

- Shrinking the black market and influence of drug cartels;
- Increased funding for proven drug education and prevention programs for youth;
- Creating tax revenue for schools and police.

Please vote Yes on Measure 91

Darian Stanford, Former Multnomah County
Deputy District Attorney

(This information furnished by Darian A. Stanford, Slinde Nelson Stanford.)

Argument in Favor

Mayor Tim Leavitt of Vancouver, Washington says: Switching from drug cartels to a legal, regulated industry is working here.

Soon Oregonians will decide whether to legalize marijuana for adults 21 and older.

Based on our experience across the Columbia River from Oregon, I can tell you that this is the right time to do it.

In Washington we have been methodical in implementing our new marijuana law. It's going well and is far better than the black market system we had before.

- In Vancouver, we want to **create a positive business climate for hardworking entrepreneurs and their customers so that businesses contribute** to the city's well-being. Retail marijuana customers coming to Vancouver also financially support other area businesses when they visit.
- **The black market, now facing competition, is in decline.** Growers and shop owners go through a rigorous licensing process designed to eliminate anyone with a questionable background.
- Vancouver and Washington are enjoying additional revenue from legal marijuana sales: In the first 30 days of sales at retailers, more than \$1 million poured into state coffers through the new taxes on marijuana.
- Police are spending time on more important crimes: Prior to legalization, Washington police arrested over 5,000 people a year for marijuana offenses, and now it's down to under 200. That frees police up to address violent crime.

With Measure 91, Oregon has a thoughtful way forward to more sensible policies towards marijuana.

While things are going well, we've also learned a lot from the legalization experience here in Washington and in Colorado. Measure 91 is designed to take advantage of those lessons and improve upon them for Oregon. And Measure 91 has built-in flexibility to adjust the law in the future if needed.

The view from the other side of the river is clear: legalizing marijuana for adults over 21 works – and with Measure 91, it will work for Oregon too.

(This information furnished by Tim Leavitt.)

Argument in Favor

A Message from Congressman Earl Blumenauer

Vote Yes on Measure 91

Because It's Time for a Better Approach to Marijuana

Dear Fellow Oregonian:

Our marijuana laws don't work and exact a terrible cost in tax dollars, law enforcement priorities and people's lives. I'm working in Congress to reform marijuana policy – and we are making progress at the national level – but it is in the states that the most constructive change has been happening. This November, Oregon has the opportunity to have a real, positive national impact.

That is why I hope you will join me in voting Yes on Ballot Measure 91.

This measure takes the right approach:

- It legalizes marijuana use for adults 21 and over.
- It strictly regulates its production, distribution and sale through the Oregon Liquor Control Commission.
- It provides more protection for kids than the current black market system. Right now, it is easier for a middle school student to get a joint than it is for them to get a six pack.
- It taxes marijuana, with the proceeds going to schools, state and local law enforcement, treatment and substance abuse education.
- It also will allow Oregon farmers to grow and sell industrial hemp, which has the potential to be a major cash crop for our agricultural economy.

Measure 91 is also carefully crafted to meet the new federal guidelines for marijuana sales, and learns from what is happening in Washington and Colorado, which have already legalized the adult use of marijuana.

We have the chance to make this long overdue change for Oregon. Vote Yes on 91 – because it's time.

Sincerely,

Earl Blumenauer
Congressman, Oregon's 3rd Congressional District

(This information furnished by Earl Blumenauer, Congressman.)

Argument in Opposition

PEDIATRICIANS AND OTHER MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS ASK: SHOULD STORES SELL POT-LACED GUMMY BEARS & COTTON CANDY?

Denver Post 5/21/2014 "The number of children coming into Colorado's largest pediatric emergency department after accidentally eating marijuana is on pace to more than double last year's total...Most of the children admitted are between 3 and 7 years old."

We are dedicated to caring for children. That's why we OPPOSE Measure 91.

It allows stores to sell pot-laced "edibles". (www.VoteNo91.com, see pictures for yourself.) **"POT tarts" instead of "POP tarts" for breakfast (the blue boxes are nearly identical). Gummy Bears. Cotton Candy. Ice Cream. Even soda pop with cartoon characters on the bottles will be on store shelves!**

These products target children! With high concentrations of THC (the chemical that gets you "high"), children need only ingest a small amount to get sick. In some cases, sick enough to die.

Measure 91 has NO restrictions on using Marijuana around children. Measure 91 has NO requirements that pot-laced candy be kept out of the reach of children at home.

Time May 21, 2014

"The effects can be serious for kids. Most of the patients were under seven years old and many were admitted to the intensive care unit, treating conditions like severe sedation, which can lead to breathing problems."

Newsweek May 22, 2014

"Deaths Prompt Colorado Crackdown on Pot Infused Food...a student...jumped to his death from a hotel balcony in March after ingesting six times the suggested maximum amount of marijuana cookies, according to the Denver medical examiner's office."

Measure 91 allows adults to have a huge amount of Marijuana at home. Four plants of ANY SIZE, 8 ounces of dried Marijuana, A FULL POUND of pot-laced edibles AND 72 ounces of THC-infused liquids like soda pop ALL AT THE SAME TIME.

Vote No on 91.

John D. Peoples, MD FAAP, Pediatrician; John A. Murphy, MD; Jennifer Arsenault, RN; Russell E. Alger, Pharmacist; Maggie Heising, ER Dept Tech

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

We are addiction counseling professionals, physicians and juvenile probation officers. **We ask you to Vote No on 91!** Here are a few reasons why:

Adults driving under the influence of Marijuana are twice as likely to be in a motor vehicle wreck than sober drivers.

Marijuana is the number one reason children in the United States are admitted into substance abuse treatment facilities.

Use of Marijuana by teenagers in Colorado is 50 percent higher than the national average since it was legalized.

One in six teenagers who smoke Marijuana becomes addicted.

From 2011 to 2013 there was a 57 percent increase in Marijuana-related Emergency Room visits in Colorado.

From the 2008 to the 2012 school years in Colorado, drug-related suspensions and expulsions increased by 32 percent.

Kenneth Finn, MD, from Colorado Springs Colorado
"I am concerned for the citizens of Oregon if they legalize marijuana for recreational use. Things are not turning out well here in Colorado and there is a rising public health concern associated with widespread use, particularly in adolescents. Despite legal age of 21, high schoolers are using more each year due to ease of access and perception of safety. Driving fatalities associated with marijuana use has risen significantly over the past several years as have accidental ingestions to very young children and pets."

Vote No on 91. Don't let Oregon get hooked on pot!
www.VoteNo91.com

Teresa Cooley, ACCBO Certified Addiction Counselor & Certified Recovery Mentor; Richard S. McKague, Juvenile Parole and Probation Officer; Jennifer O'Keefe, BS, QMHA Addictions and Mental Health Intake Specialist; Mandi Puckett, Certified Prevention Specialist; Connie Ramaekers, Prevention Specialist; John L. Spomer, D.M.D.

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

New Approach Oregon is Lying to You

New Approach Oregon and their big-out-of-state donors behind Measure 91, are lying to Oregon voters. Your elected, county District Attorneys want to set the record straight.

You don't have to believe us, just read the newspaper:
<http://www.politifact.com/oregon/statements/>

Were 12,808 people in Oregon arrested for marijuana-related crimes in 2012?

Politifact Answer: FALSE

The claim: In campaign literature and on its website, New Approach Oregon says police "arrested" 12,808 people in 2012 for marijuana-related crimes. The group makes the claim twice in a media packet and two more times in a "Myth vs. Fact" section on its website, newapproachoregon.com.

More than 12,000 in one year? That seemed like a lot, especially since Oregon decriminalized possession of small amounts years ago.

The truth: The truth is that 10,054 of those 12,808 people were only cited for possessing less than an ounce of marijuana -- a violation, like a speeding ticket. **THEY WERE NOT ARRESTED.**

New Approach Oregon is wrong by almost 80 percent!

According to the State Police spokesman, "Someone cannot be taken into custody and lodged in jail for a violation offense." That leaves only 2,754 actual arrests for Marijuana (not their outrageous claim of 12,808). Most arrests are for very large quantities and distribution.

District Attorneys are also very concerned that **MEASURE 91 PROVIDES NO GUIDELINES TO DETERMINE WHETHER A PERSON IS DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF MARIJUANA.**

PART OF THE PROBLEM IS THERE IS NO TEST CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TO MEASURE MARIJUANA LIKE THE BREATHALYZER TEST USED TO MEASURE ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION.

Measure 91 has too many problems, too many loop-holes and too many opportunities for young children to gain access to dangerous amounts of pot-laced candies in their homes.

Vote No on 91. Liars Should Never Prosper. VoteNo91.com

(This information furnished by Joshua Marquis, Oregon District Attorneys Association.)

Argument in Opposition

Deaths from marijuana-related accidents increase 100% in five years in Colorado

ABC News Channel 7 in DENVER August 19, 2014
 "A study out this month [August] finds the number of people killed in marijuana-related accidents in Colorado has increased 100 percent over five years.

"The report ... says that in 2012 there were 78 fatalities where someone involved in the accident (a driver, bike rider, pedestrian) tested positive for marijuana, compared to 39 in 2007."

The **Sheriffs of Oregon** and **Oregon Chiefs of Police Association** Oppose Measure 91.

TOP TEN LIST FOR OPPOSING MEASURE 91

10. No legal guidelines to determine whether a person is driving under the influence of Marijuana;
9. Adults driving under the influence of Marijuana are TWICE as likely to be in a motor vehicle accident;
8. Marijuana is the top reason U.S. children are admitted into substance abuse programs;
7. In Colorado, from 2007-2012, fatal accidents involving marijuana increased 100 percent;
6. Marijuana use among Colorado teens is 50 percent above the national average since they legalized Marijuana;
5. One in six teenagers who try Marijuana become addicted;
4. Teen drinking is a huge problem, so why does Measure 91 give OLCC responsibility to curb Marijuana use by teens when it can't stop teen drinking?
3. Every adult can own four mature plants OF ANY SIZE, 8 oz of dried Marijuana, a FULL POUND of pot-laced edibles and 72 oz of THC infused liquids. That's too much;
2. Stores can sell pot-laced candy: Gummy bears, cotton candy, soda pop, cookies, and suckers will be on store shelves if the measure passes. Supporters say these "edibles" are for adults, but kids are ending up in Emergency Rooms from eating mom and dad's "candy";
1. Oregon police are already underfunded. By increasing pot users and how much they can own, the police simply won't be able to keep up with all the problems caused by legal use.

VOTE NO ON 91

(This information furnished by Darrell Fuller, Sheriffs of Oregon.)

Argument in Opposition

The Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) has a tough job.

OLCC is the state agency charged with licensing businesses which sell liquor in Oregon, including beer and wine. They are also responsible for keeping alcohol away from children who are not yet old enough to drink.

No matter how hard the OLCC tries, and no matter what the OLCC does, kids who want to drink will find a way to get alcohol. **The OLCC just can't stop teen-age drinking.**

With this in mind, it is a little surprising that Measure 91 gives the responsibility of keeping Marijuana away from children to the very agency that already can't keep alcohol from children.

Do the New Approach Oregon folks, who want to legalize pot, really think OLCC can handle more work and more responsibility when they already can't keep liquor away from children?

Measure 91 will not allow the OLCC to require parents to keep Marijuana out of reach from children.

Measure 91 will not allow the OLCC to prohibit parents from keeping pot-laced candy, cookies, ice cream and soda pop around very young children.

Measure 91 will tie the hands of OLCC to modify or restrict the amount of Marijuana one person can have at home.

Measure 91 specifically permits one person to have ALL OF THE FOLLOWING AT THE SAME TIME:

4 mature Marijuana Plants of ANY SIZE

8 ounces of dried, usable Marijuana

A FULL POUND of edible Marijuana-laced "edibles" like cotton candy, gummy bears, cookies and ice cream (see it for yourself at www.NoOn91.com)

AND 72 ounces of pot-laced liquids like soda pop

This is just TOO MUCH MARIJUANA FOR ONE PERSON TO HAVE.

The OLCC is busy enough trying to keep alcohol away from kids. If the OLCC can't stop kids from getting alcohol, then why should we give them control of Marijuana, too? It just doesn't make sense.

Vote No On 91! VoteNo91.com

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

Being a kid is hard enough without making Marijuana more acceptable and more accessible

As educators at all levels, we see the difficulties which result when students fall into drug abuse. It's devastating to watch a promising young life get caught up in substance abuse. Making marijuana legal and allowing adults to keep large amounts of it at home, readily accessible to kids, is just wrong.

Here are some key reasons to Vote No on 91. There WILL BE A TEST on election day!

1. Marijuana is the number one reason children in the United States are admitted into substance abuse treatment facilities.
2. Marijuana use among Colorado teens is 50% above the national average since legalizing the use of Marijuana.
3. Studies show ONE IN SIX teenagers who try Marijuana become addicted.
4. Marijuana-laced "edibles" will be legalized. That means homes, even those with small children, will be able to have a FULL POUND of pot-laced candy, ice cream and cookies with no requirements to store them away from children. The law also allows up to 72 ounces of pot-laced drinks like soda pop.
5. In addition to the pot-laced edibles and soda pop mentioned above, adults will also be able to own 4 mature Marijuana plants of any size and 8 oz of dried, usable marijuana. That's just too much for one person, and too much to have around small children.
6. A National Academy of Sciences study shows an average drop of 8 points in IQ following heavy use of marijuana in teen years. And the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that two-thirds of students who received mostly Ds and Fs were heavy marijuana users.

Please join public school educators across the state and Vote No on 91!

Marlys L. Alger, Retired Principal; Cindy Baumgartner, High School Teacher, No on 91 PAC; William Bond, High School Teacher; Amy McConnell, Elementary School Teacher; Stacy Roberts, Middle School Teacher

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

**Drunk driving kills. That's indisputable.
Driving while high can be deadly, too.
That's also indisputable.**

Measure 91 has NO standard for the police to use to determine if someone is "too high" to drive. And unlike alcohol, the police can't administer a simple breath test to check how high a driver is at the side of the road.

Legalizing Marijuana will increase consumption. Increased consumption means more drivers on the road under the influence of pot. Measure 91 ignores the dangers of driving while high by NOT establishing a legal standard for "too high" to drive. While it is unlawful to drive with an open container of beer, what about eating a pot-laced brownie while you drive? Measure 91 is silent.

Research proves adults driving under the influence of Marijuana are **twice as likely to be in a motor vehicle accident** than someone who is not high (CBS News February 10, 2012).

Excerpts from the news story:

"Marijuana smokers may want to put down the pipe before picking up their car keys. A new study shows smoking a doobie nearly doubles your risk of crashing your car."

"What's more, the drivers in the study were not necessarily baking behind the wheel. The study found using marijuana within three hours of driving raised risks for accidents 1.75 times."

"In October [2011], Mothers Against Drunk Driving launched a public awareness campaign to highlight the dangers of drugged driving... Gil Kerlikowske, director of National Drug Control Policy [Canada], said at the time that a recent report showed 3,952 drivers fatally injured in car crashes tested positive for drugs - about 18 percent of all fatally injured drivers."

**Are you against drunk driving? Isn't everyone? Are you against driving while high on pot?
If you don't want more people driving doped,
then vote No on 91.**

**Don't let more doped drivers on the road. Vote No on 91.
VoteNo91.com**

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

**Measure 91 will keep Firefighters busy.
(That's not a good thing.)**

Excerpts from Seattle Times February 8, 2014
Amateur hash-oil production, explosions bound to continue
...In its Weed Issue last year, Rolling Stone called hash oil "America's insanely baked future." Mark Kleiman, author of "Marijuana Legalization," has predicted that concentrated [marijuana] extracts will eventually eclipse traditional marijuana in the state's new recreational-pot industry...

...From Spokane to Seattle, Vancouver to Mount Vernon, amateur chemists have caused explosions in recent months, often in homes, while using flammable solvents to produce hash oil. [In January], hash-related explosions caused \$100,000 in damage to a Kirkland apartment and lifted a South Seattle house off its foundation...

...A search of news reports last year turns up stories of hash-oil explosions from Florida to Hawaii, with a rash along the West Coast. The Oregonian reported a Jan. 10 blast in Forest Grove that left a man in critical condition. In the past 14 months, at least 17 people have landed in Southern California burn centers due to hash-oil accidents, according to the Los Angeles Times...**noting that the hash-oil toll was far worse than injuries attributed to meth-lab explosions in the same period...**

..."They're walking on a cliff with no safety net whatsoever. It only takes one little thing to get you off kilter and you'll cause an explosion," he said... **"Kids are going to do it while their parents are not at home,"** he said...

Modern hash oil tends to have 40 to 70 percent THC. "We've seen purities as high as 73 percent," said Jodie Underwood, spokeswoman for the federal Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)...

Please vote No on 91. VoteNo91.com

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

OUR FIRST RESPONDERS DON'T NEED MORE 9-1-1 CALLS

It is emotionally draining to watch nightly news reports filled with stories about first responders getting 9-1-1 calls because a toddler is unconscious, maybe even turning blue and not breathing. Seconds count.

We all want to protect children from harm and **Measure 91 is harmful to children.** It's just that simple.

Measure 91 will allow stores to sell pot-laced candy. "POT tarts" instead of "POP tarts" for example. And the boxes are nearly identical. Toddlers, elementary-school students, and many middle and high school students could easily confuse one box for the other and end up in the ER because these legal "edibles" contain highly concentrated amounts of THC. To see pictures of POT tarts and other pot-laced candy products for yourself, just go to www.VoteNo91.com.

These dangerous, pot-laced products designed to attract the attention of children should be banned, but Measure 91 allows adults to possess up to a FULL POUND of pot-candy at any one time (along with 4 mature plants of ANY SIZE, 8 oz of useable Marijuana and 72 oz of pot-infused drinks like soda pop).

And **Measure 91 has no requirements for parents to keep their pot-candy out of the reach of children.** It is a prescription for disaster!

We have the advantage of watching what is happening in Washington and Colorado since they legalized marijuana:

- ER visits by children consuming pot-laced candy is skyrocketing.
- The number of traffic wrecks related to marijuana use is increasing.
- Marijuana use among teens in Colorado has jumped since legalization.

Please Vote No on 91. VoteNo91.com

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

**YOU DON'T NEED TO WEAR A BLACK ROBE
TO PASS JUDGMENT ON MEASURE 91
YOU JUST NEED COMMON SENSE**

**VOTE NO ON 91
TOO MANY PROBLEMS & TOO MUCH MARIJUANA**

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the gold standard in Oregon courtrooms. Prosecutors must prove their cases to judges and juries every day. When it comes to driving under the influence of Marijuana, that job becomes much more difficult.

Did you know Ballot Measure 91 has no guidelines to determine whether a person is driving under the influence of Marijuana?

If someone is driving drunk, police officers can administer a breathalyzer to determine conclusively if they are under the influence.

NO SUCH TEST EXISTS TODAY TO MEASURE DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF MARIJUANA!

Already in Oregon, specially-trained police officers must be dispatched to observe and arrest stoned drivers. This expensive training process for the police helps them convict doped drivers in court. But there are not nearly enough of these specially-trained officers to keep our roads safe from the expected increase in drivers who will be driving while high on Marijuana if Measure 91 passes.

MEASURE 91 ISN'T AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN, IT IS HUNDREDS OF ACCIDENTS WAITING TO HAPPEN!

Judge Tom Kohl
Gary S. Thompson, Senior Judge

Vote No on 91! www.NoOn91.com

(This information furnished by Mandi Puckett, Director of No on 91 PAC.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGON STATE ELKS ASSOCIATION SAYS NO ON MEASURE 91 SAVE OUR KIDS FROM LOST POTENTIAL

Measure 91 is **POORLY WRITTEN** and has **MANY LOOPHOLES**, such as;

1. Requires that a State agency license unlimited marijuana grow sites and marijuana storefronts without requiring Oregon residency
2. Has no restrictions on the locations of grows and storefronts
3. Anyone 21 and over can possess at home large quantities of unlicensed, untaxed, and unregulated marijuana and products providing easy access for children
4. Does not require marijuana drugged driving testing guidelines
5. Speculated tax revenues will not cover the costs

While proponents of legalization point to increased tax revenues, and alleged reductions in law enforcement and confinement costs, the consequences of legalization, particularly on our children, would be disastrous! Legalization sends the message that marijuana is not harmful and will make marijuana more available, which would lead to increased use among our children. Research has shown that marijuana use that begins in adolescence can lower IQ by as much as 8 points, leading to impaired health, increased delinquent behavior, and impaired driving.

We have all seen the movies that feature young pot smoking stoners like Jeff Spicoli in "Fast Times at Ridgmont High," and have laughed at their ridiculous antics. Unfortunately, the behavior of this character is not so unfamiliar with many of our children who are using marijuana regularly.

This measure has been funded by out-of-state drug pushers, whose only intent is to legalize marijuana to make a lot of money at the expense of our young adults.

We may not have a lot of money, but we do have a voice. As Elks and Americans it is our duty to protect our children and ensure that they have the best opportunity for a successful life. Increased marijuana use among our youth only leads to lost potential!

DON'T BELIEVE THE LIES OF MEASURE 91

VOTE NO!

(This information furnished by Steven M Armbruster, Oregon State Elks Association Drug Awareness Chairman.)

Argument in Opposition

OREGONIANS ALREADY SAID "NO" TO LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

MEASURE 91-BIG MARIJUANA! BIG RISK! BIG MISTAKE!

1. Creates limitless numbers of marijuana grow sites and cash-only pot shops
2. Demands unlimited licenses to non-residents
3. Permits unregulated, untaxed, unlicensed in-home grows
4. Impacts every jurisdiction

DID YOU KNOW?

- **Under M91 "regulation" means only that unlimited numbers of low tax cash-only marijuana grow sites and pot shops with no required Oregon residency will be licensed by a State agency in unrestricted locations by your home, daycare, and preschool.**
- **M91 has no limitations on who can own marijuana licenses;** this means that out-of-state residents can be a (producer, processor, wholesaler, and/or retailer) and own unlimited licenses in any category. An open invitation to out-of-state illicit drug cartels.
- **Under M91 anyone over 21 is allowed at home:**
 1. **Half-pound** of dried marijuana
 2. **4 UNREGULATED, UNLICENSED AND UNTAXED plants**
 3. An **Ounce** of concentrates which may include 95%-100% pure THC
 4. **Pound** of edibles
 5. **Six-pack** (72 ounces) of tinctures

- **Leaves unregulated in-home grow pesticide-mold testing and child protection access requirements,** minimizing health and safety standards.

Creates **EASY ACCESS** to marijuana next to your home and rental homes and endangers others because of invasion robberies, marijuana hash-oil extraction explosions, and electrical fires.

Excess marijuana sold to the **BLACK-MARKET** would be **UNENFORCEABLE**, by law enforcement.

- **M91 does not change Oregon's non-taxed, non-FDA approved, unregulated medical marijuana program,** which allows 6 mature and 18 immature marijuana plants, and a pound and a half dried. M91 layers another commercial industry on top of a broken medical marijuana industry.
- **Providing total State government control, M91 would eliminate jurisdictions rights** to prohibit pot shops except through a citizen petition election and eradicates their right to impose any fees or taxes and refuses to give jurisdictions any tax monies if they have prohibited pot shops.

M91 IS AN UNREGULATED SUBSTANDARD GOVERNMENT RUSE!

WE DON'T WANT OUR KIDS TO BECOME THE VICTIMS OF M91'S

DISTURBING AND CARELESS SOCIAL EXPERIMENT!

PROTECT OREGON-VOTE NO ON BIG MARIJUANA!

(This information furnished by Shirley A Morgan, Oregonians Against Legalization of Marijuana.)

Proposed by initiative petition to be voted on at the General Election, November 4, 2014.

Ballot Title

92

Requires food manufacturers, retailers to label “genetically engineered” foods as such; state, citizens may enforce

Estimate of Financial Impact	123
Text of Measure	124
Explanatory Statement	126
Citizens’ Review Statement	127
Arguments in Favor	128
Arguments in Opposition	135

Result of “Yes” Vote

“Yes” vote requires the labeling of raw and packaged foods produced entirely or partially by “genetic engineering,” effective January 2016; applies to retailers, suppliers, manufacturers.

Result of “No” Vote

“No” vote retains existing law, which does not require “genetically engineered” food to be labeled as such.

Summary

Current law does not require labeling of “genetically engineered” food. Measure requires retailers of genetically engineered raw food to include “Genetically Engineered” on packages, display bins, or shelves; suppliers must label shipping containers. Requires manufacturers of packaged food produced entirely or partially by genetic engineering to include “Produced with Genetic Engineering” or “Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering” on packages. Defines “genetically engineered” food as food produced from organisms with genetic material changed through *in vitro* nucleic acid techniques and certain cell-fusing techniques; exempts traditional plant-breeding techniques like hybridization. Does not apply to animal feed or food served in restaurants. Directs agencies to implement law. Permits state, injured citizen to sue manufacturer, retailer for knowing/intentional violation; attorney fees for prevailing citizen. Other provisions.

Estimate of Financial Impact

The measure requires the State Department of Agriculture and/or the Oregon Health Authority to prescribe, enact, and enforce rules necessary to ensure that food manufacturers and retailers properly label raw and packaged food that is entirely or partially produced with genetic engineering. The measure is expected to result in direct expenditures by State agencies for initial one time start-up costs estimated at between \$550,000 and \$600,000. Costs associated with ongoing enforcement have variable assumptions about the level of administrative oversight. There are potential indirect economic effects that may be offsetting. Therefore, the direct financial impact and indirect economic impact is indeterminate.

There is no anticipated effect on local government.

Text of Measure

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OREGON: AN ACT REQUIRING THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED RAW AND PACKAGED FOOD

Section 1. Findings and Declarations

(1) Oregon consumers have the right to know whether the foods they purchase were produced with genetic engineering so they can make informed purchasing decisions. Labeling is necessary to ensure that Oregon consumers are fully and reliably informed about the products they purchase and consume. Labels provide informed consent and prevent consumer deception. Polls consistently show that the vast majority of the public wants to know if its food was produced with genetic engineering, for a variety of reasons.

(2) For multiple health, personal, economic, environmental, religious, and cultural reasons, the State of Oregon finds that food produced with genetic engineering should be labeled as such, as evidenced by the following.

(3) In the United States, there is currently no federal or Oregon State requirement that genetically engineered foods be labeled. In contrast, sixty-four countries, including Japan, South Korea, China, Australia, Russia, India, the European Union member states, and other key U.S. trading partners, already have laws mandating disclosure of genetically engineered foods on food labels. In 2011, Codex Alimentarius, the food standards organization of the United Nations, stated that governments are free to decide on whether and how to label foods produced with genetic engineering.

(4) The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does not require or conduct safety studies of genetically engineered foods. Instead, any safety consultations are voluntary, and genetically engineered food developers may decide what information to provide to the agency. Market approval of genetically engineered food is based on industry research alone. There have been no long-term or epidemiological studies in the U.S. that examine the safety of human consumption of genetically engineered foods.

(5) The genetic engineering of plants and animals often causes unintended consequences. Manipulating genes via genetic engineering and inserting them into organisms is an imprecise process. The results are not always predictable or controllable. Mixing plant, animal, bacterial, and viral genes through genetic engineering in combinations that cannot occur in nature may produce results that lead to adverse health or environmental consequences.

(6) U.S. government scientists have stated that the artificial insertion of genetic material into plants via genetic engineering can cause a variety of significant problems with plant foods. Such genetic engineering may increase the levels of known toxicants or allergens in foods and create new toxicants or allergens with consequent health concerns.

(7) Independent scientists are limited from conducting safety and risk-assessment research of genetically engineered materials used in food products due to industry restrictions on research of genetically engineered materials used in food products.

(8) Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can provide a method for detecting, at a large epidemiological scale, the potential health effects of consuming such foods.

(9) Without mandatory disclosure, consumers of genetically engineered food may unknowingly violate their dietary and religious beliefs.

(10) Numerous foreign markets with restrictions on foods produced with genetic engineering have restricted imports of U.S. crops due to concerns about genetic engineering. Some

foreign markets are choosing to purchase agricultural products from countries other than the U.S. because genetically engineered crops are not identified in the U.S., which makes it impossible for buyers to determine what does or does not meet their national labeling laws or restrictions and thus renders U.S. products less desirable.

(11) Mandatory identification of foods produced with genetic engineering can be a critical method of preserving the economic value of exports or domestically sensitive markets with restrictions on, or prohibitions against, genetic engineering.

(12) Oregon's agricultural economy is remarkably diverse, third overall among the states. Two hundred twenty-five agricultural commodities are produced in Oregon, and the state is the top producer nationally of 14 of those. Over 80 percent of Oregon's agricultural products are exported out of state, and agricultural products rank second in value among Oregon's exports. Preserving the identity, quality, and reliability of Oregon's agricultural products and exports is critical to Oregon's economic well-being.

(13) The organic food industry is a rapidly growing industry, with 2.7 billion dollars in growth in 2012. While total U.S. food sales grew at a rate of 3.7 percent, the organic food industry grew at a rate of 10.2 percent in 2012, accounting for 31.5 billion dollars in sales. Sales of organic fruits and vegetables account for 43 percent of those new dollars, 34.8 percent of total organic food sales, and 10.3 percent of all U.S. fruit and vegetable sales. Organic dairy grew at a rate of 7.1 percent in 2012 and comprises over 6 percent of the total U.S. dairy market. Trade industry data shows that, over the long term, organic farming is more profitable and economically secure than conventional farming. Organic farmers are prohibited from using genetically engineered seeds. Nonetheless, organic crops are routinely threatened with transgenic contamination from neighboring fields of genetically engineered crops. The risk of contamination can erode public confidence in organic products, significantly undermining the job-creating, economy-boosting growth of the organic market. Requiring the labeling of foods produced through genetic engineering will help protect organics nationwide by increasing identification of genetically engineered foods through the food production process, thereby reducing the risk of contamination.

(14) U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) data shows that Oregon ranks 3rd in organic farm-gate sales at \$233 million a year. This important element of Oregon's economy must be protected. Foods identified as non-genetically engineered constitute the fastest growing market segment in agriculture. However, only a small portion of the food industry participates in voluntary labeling of foods claimed not to be the product of genetic engineering. Nor are there consistent standards for such labeling, or for enforcement of voluntary labels. As such, voluntary labels are insufficient to provide consumers with adequate information on whether or not the food they are purchasing was produced with genetic engineering and may be misleading.

(15) Requiring that foods produced through genetic engineering be labeled as such will create additional market opportunities for producers who are not certified as organic and whose products are not produced through genetic engineering. Such additional market opportunities will also contribute to vibrant and diversified agricultural communities.

(16) The cultivation of genetically engineered crops can have serious effects on the environment. For example, in 2013, 93 percent of all soy grown in the U.S. was engineered to be herbicide resistant. In fact, the vast majority of genetically engineered crops are designed to withstand herbicides, and therefore promote indiscriminate herbicide use. As a result, genetically engineered, herbicide resistant crops have caused 527 million pounds of additional herbicides to be applied to the nation's farmland. These toxic herbicides damage the vitality and quality of our soil, harm wildlife, contaminate

our drinking water, and pose health risks to consumers and farm workers. Further, because of the consequent massive increase in the use of herbicides, herbicide-resistant weeds have developed and flourished, infesting farm fields and roadsides, complicating weed control for farmers, and causing farmers to resort to more and increasingly toxic herbicides.

(17) The people of Oregon should have the choice to avoid purchasing foods produced in ways that can lead to such environmental harm.

(18) Because neither the FDA nor the U.S. Congress requires the labeling of food produced with genetic engineering, the State should require foods produced with genetic engineering to be labeled as such in order to serve the interests of the State, prevent consumer deception, prevent potential risks to human health, promote food safety, protect cultural and religious practices, protect the environment, and promote economic development.

Section 2. Statement of Purpose

(1) The Genetically Engineered Raw and Packaged Food Labeling Act would result in establishing a consistent and enforceable standard for labeling foods produced using genetic engineering, and thus provide the citizens of Oregon with knowledge of how their food is produced.

(2) The purposes of this Act are:

a. Public health and food safety. Promote food safety and protect public health by enabling consumers to avoid potential risks associated with genetically engineered foods, and serve as a risk management tool enabling consumers, physicians, and scientists to identify unintended health effects resulting from consumption of genetically engineered foods.

b. Environmental impacts. Assist consumers who are concerned about the potential effects of genetic engineering on the environment to make informed purchasing decisions.

c. Consumer confusion and deception. Reduce and prevent consumer confusion and deception and promote the disclosure of factual information on food labels to allow consumers to make informed decisions.

d. Promoting and protecting economic development. Create and protect non-genetically engineered markets and enable consumers to make informed purchasing decisions.

e. Protecting religious and cultural practice. Provide consumers with data from which they may make informed decisions for personal, religious, moral, cultural, or ethical reasons.

(3) This law shall be liberally construed to fulfill these purposes.

Section 3. Definitions

(1) As used in this Act, except as otherwise provided, terms shall have the meaning given to them in ORS Title 49, Chapter 616, except that the term "food" shall include food only for human consumption and not any food for consumption by animals.

(2) "Raw food" shall have the same meaning as raw agricultural commodity as defined in ORS 616.205(17).

(3) "Packaged food" means any food offered for retail sale in Oregon, other than raw food and food served, sold, or provided ready to eat in any bake sale, restaurant, or cafeteria, and that is already otherwise subject to the provisions of ORS 616.250 prohibiting misbranding.

(4) "Genetically engineered" means produced from an organism or organisms in which the genetic material has been changed through the application of:

(a) *In vitro* nucleic acid techniques which include, but are not limited to, recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA)

or ribonucleic acid (RNA), direct injection of nucleic acid into cells or organelles, encapsulation, gene deletion, and doubling; or

(b) Methods of fusing cells beyond the taxonomic family that overcome natural physiological, reproductive, or recombination barriers, and that are not techniques used in traditional breeding and selection such as conjugation, transduction, and hybridization.

For purposes of this definition: "*In vitro* nucleic acid techniques" include, but are not limited to, recombinant DNA or RNA techniques that use vector systems; techniques involving the direct introduction into the organisms of hereditary materials prepared outside the organisms such as biolistics, microinjection, macro-injection, chemoporation, electroporation, microencapsulation, and liposome fusion.

Section 4. Labeling of Genetically Engineered Raw and Packaged Foods

Commencing January 1, 2016, all raw food and packaged food that is entirely or partially produced with genetic engineering must be labeled in accordance with the provisions of this Act and is otherwise misbranded if that fact is not disclosed.

Section 5. Means of Labeling

(1) In the case of raw food packaged for retail sale, the manufacturer shall include the words "Genetically Engineered" clearly and conspicuously on the front or back of the package of such commodity. In the case of raw agricultural commodities that are not separately packaged or labeled, the retailer shall place a clear and conspicuous label on the retail store shelf or bin in which such commodity is displayed for sale.

(2) To make clear who is responsible for compliance with the requirements of this section, in the case of raw food, the retailer is responsible only for point of purchase shelf labeling. The supplier must label each container used for packaging, holding, and/or transporting any raw food produced with genetic engineering that is delivered directly to Oregon retailers.

(3) In the case of any packaged food containing some products of genetic engineering, the manufacturer must label the product in clear and conspicuous language on the front or back of the package of such food product with the words "Produced with Genetic Engineering" or "Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering."

(4) This law shall not be construed to require either the listing or identification of any ingredient or ingredients that were genetically engineered or that the term "genetically engineered" be placed immediately preceding any common name or primary product descriptor of a food.

Section 6. Enforcement

(1) The Attorney General may bring an action to enjoin a violation of this Act in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) Any injured citizen of Oregon acting in the public interest may bring an action to enjoin a violation of this Act by a manufacturer or retailer, in any court of competent jurisdiction, if the action is commenced more than sixty (60) days after the citizen has given notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General and to the alleged violator. The court may, in such an action, award to a citizen who is a prevailing plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in investigating and prosecuting the action, but the court may not award any monetary damages.

(3) No person shall be subject to an injunction or responsible for payment of prevailing party attorneys' fees for failure to label any food if (a) in the case of packaged food, the materials produced through genetic engineering do not account for more than nine tenths of one percent of the total weight of the packaged food; or (b) the food has not been produced with the knowing or intentional use of genetic engineering.

(4) For purposes of this Act, food will be considered not to have been produced with the knowing or intentional use of genetic engineering if:

(a) such food is lawfully certified to be labeled, marketed, and offered for sale as “organic” pursuant to the federal Organic Foods Production Act of 1990, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6501 *et seq.*, which already prohibits genetic engineering of foods;

(b) in the case of a manufacturer or retailer obligated to label any food under this Act, if such entity has obtained from whoever sold that food to them a sworn statement that the food has not been knowingly or intentionally genetically engineered and has been segregated from, and not knowingly or intentionally commingled with, foods that may have been genetically engineered at any time. In providing such a sworn statement, a manufacturer or retailer may rely on a sworn statement from a supplier that contains such an affirmation; or

(c) an independent organization has determined that the food has not been knowingly or intentionally genetically engineered and has been segregated from, and not knowingly or intentionally commingled with, foods that may have been genetically engineered at any time, if such a determination has been made pursuant to a sampling and testing procedure (i) consistent with sampling and testing principles recommended by internationally recognized standards organizations and (ii) which does not rely on testing processed foods in which no DNA is detectable.

(5) Unless the retailer is also the producer or the manufacturer of the food and sells the food under a brand it owns, no act or omission or any retailer shall be found to be a violation of this Act except for knowing and willful failure to provide point of purchase labeling for unpackaged raw agricultural commodities. In any action in which it is alleged that a retailer has violated the provisions of this section, it shall be a defense that such retailer reasonably relied on (a) any disclosure whether a food was produced through genetic engineering contained in the bill of sale or invoice provided by the wholesaler or distributor or (b) the lack of such disclosure.

(6) No action may be brought against any farmer for any violation of any provision of this Act unless such farmer is also a retailer or manufacturer, but any farmer submitting a false sworn statement under subsection (4) of this section shall be subject to the general laws of the state pertaining to perjury.

(7) The State Department of Agriculture and/or the Oregon Health Authority shall prescribe, enact, and enforce rules necessary to implement this Act. The Department and Authority are not authorized to exempt from the requirements of Section 4 of this Act any food product that is made subject to those requirements by the provisions of this Act. The Department and/or Authority may by regulation provide that a person may be subject to an injunction and prevailing party attorneys’ fees under this Act for failure to label packaged food described in subsection 3(a) of this Section 6 at such time as the Department and/or Authority determine that the commercial availability of relevant materials not produced with genetic engineering make it economically and commercially practicable to apply the labeling requirements of this Act to such packaged food.

Section 7. Severability

If any part or application of this Act is held invalid with respect to any particular raw or packaged food, situation, or entity, the remainder of this Act or its application to all other raw and packaged foods, situations, and entities shall not be affected.

Explanatory Statement

This measure creates a labeling law, effective January 1, 2016, for raw and packaged foods for human use, wholly or partly made through genetic engineering, as defined. Food is subject to labeling if made from or produced with organisms in which genetic material has been changed through certain defined techniques or methods.

Manufacturers of packaged raw food must include “Genetically Engineered” clearly and conspicuously on the packaging. For unpackaged raw food, the retailer must label the shelf or bin where the food is displayed. Suppliers must label containers used for raw food delivered directly to retailers.

For packaged food containing products of genetic engineering, the manufacturer must label the package “Produced with Genetic Engineering” or “Partially Produced with Genetic Engineering.”

Food sold ready to eat at bake sales, restaurants and cafeterias would not be subject to labeling.

The Attorney General or an injured citizen may bring a court action to enjoin a violation. A citizen must give 60 days’ notice to the Attorney General and the alleged violator before bringing an action. A court may not award damages, only attorney fees and costs to a prevailing citizen.

It is not a violation of the measure if the food was not produced with the intentional or knowing use of genetic engineering. A food is not produced with the intentional or knowing use of genetic engineering if it is organic under federal law, if the supplier made a sworn statement that it was not commingled or genetically engineered or if an independent organization determines, based on testing, that it was not commingled and the use was not intentional or knowing.

It is not a violation of the measure to fail to label packaged food if genetically engineered materials account for 0.9 percent or less of the packaged food’s weight. However, a state agency could require labeling if it determines that comparable materials that are not produced with genetic engineering are economically and commercially practicable substitutes for genetically engineered materials.

Retailers that fail to label do not violate the measure unless the failure is knowing or willful. Retailers have a defense if their supplier stated in a bill of sale or invoice that the food was not genetically engineered or did not say that the food was genetically engineered. The retailer is not responsible for other violations unless the retailer is also the manufacturer or producer and sells the food under the retailer’s brand.

Farmers cannot commit a violation of the measure unless they are also a manufacturer or retailer. Farmers who make a false sworn statement that food is not genetically engineered are subject to perjury laws.

The measure makes findings regarding genetically engineered food and labeling. The measure states six purposes, and is intended to establish a consistent and enforceable standard for labeling foods produced with genetic engineering and to provide the citizens of Oregon with knowledge of how their food is produced.

The State Department of Agriculture, Oregon Health Authority or both must adopt rules to enforce the measure.

Committee Members:

George Kimbrell
Paige Richardson
Scott Dahlman*
Pat McCormick*
Paul De Muniz

Appointed by:

Chief Petitioner
Chief Petitioners
Secretary of State
Secretary of State
Members of the Committee

*Member dissents (does not concur with explanatory statement)

(This committee was appointed to provide an impartial explanation of the ballot measure pursuant to ORS 251.215.)

Citizens' Review Statement

This Citizens' Statement, authorized by the 2011 State Legislature, was developed by an independent panel of 20 Oregon voters overseen by the Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review Commission. The panelists were randomly selected from registered voters in Oregon and balanced to fairly reflect the state's voting population based on location of residence, party registration, age, gender, education, ethnicity, and likelihood of voting. Over a period of three and a half days the panel heard from initiative proponents, opponents, and background witnesses. The panelists deliberated about the measure and produced this statement. This statement has not been edited, altered, or approved by the Secretary of State.

The opinions expressed in this statement are those of the members of a citizen panel and were developed through the citizens' review process. They are NOT official opinions or positions endorsed by the State of Oregon or any government agency. A citizen panel is not a judge of the constitutionality or legality of any ballot measure, and any statements about such matters are not binding on a court of law.

Key Findings

- Labeling genetically engineered foods would provide information to let Oregonians make more informed buying decisions and this would offer them more control and transparency over their food purchasing decisions.
- The labeling requirements do not apply to alcoholic beverages, or prepared restaurant food because they are currently outside the food labeling system laws.
- Regardless of M92, consumers seeking GMO-free food can purchase items labeled non-GMO or organic.
- 64 countries, including most of Europe, Australia and Japan, already require labeling of genetically engineered foods and when those countries switched to requiring labeling food prices did not go up.
- The costs of actual labeling are a tiny fraction of the costs of compliance and certification. The bulk of private costs arise in segregation of products along the supply chain.
- Under M92, if passed, meat and dairy products from animals that have been raised and fed with genetically engineered feed and grain will not be labeled GE.
- Labels required by Measure 92 would NOT tell consumers which ingredients in a packaged food product are GMOs, or what percentage of the product is GMO ingredients.
- If we are going to sell GMO salmon that contain genes from an eel-like organism (something the FDA may soon approve), or other engineered fish or meat now in development, we should label them.
- Importantly, these costs will be borne by firms and consumers for both GM and non-GM foods as labeling foods as non-GM will require oversight costs.
- U.S. food producers already label their GMO foods in 64 countries.

Citizen Statement in Support of the Measure

Position taken by 9 of 20 panelists

- M92 would offer Oregonians more control and transparency over our food purchasing decisions and does not act as a warning or ban.
- Labeling genetically engineered crops could benefit Oregon family farmers that grow traditional crops by increasing public demand for crops that are not genetically engineered.
- U.S. food producers already label their GMO food in 64 countries, including Australia, Japan, and most of Europe.
- There is mounting scientific evidence that the widespread use of genetically engineered crops designed to survive large amounts of herbicide spraying is leading to a large increase in the use of these chemicals.
- A national consumer organization and a regional medical organization have stated that there are still questions about the long-term health effects of genetically engineered crops.

Citizen Statement in Opposition to the Measure

Position taken by 11 of 20 panelists

- Under M92, if passed, meat and dairy products from animals that have been raised and fed with genetically engineered feed and grain will not be labeled GM.
- The costs of actual labeling are a tiny fraction of the costs of compliance and certification.
- Labels required by Measure 92 would NOT tell consumers which ingredients in a packaged food product are GMOs, or what percentage of the product is GMO ingredients.
- Existing food labels already give consumers a more reliable way to choose foods without GE ingredients if that is what they prefer, including "organic" and "non-GMO" labels. Measure 92 conflicts with these national labeling standards.
- Thousands of food products would have to be labeled as "genetically engineered" – even if they're not. Thousands of other food products would be exempt from being labeled – even when they do contain or are produced with GMOs.

Argument in Favor

Oregon's Leading Conservation Groups Urge a YES Vote on Measure 92

Oregon League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club and the Oregon Environmental Council believe **Oregonians have a right to know that...**

- Most genetically engineered food crops are created in a lab to contain pesticides within them or to tolerate large quantities of herbicides.
- Studies show that, from 1996 to 2011, genetic engineering has caused the amount of herbicide sprayed on our food to increase by over 500 million pounds.
- Genetic engineering leads to increasing amounts of pesticides not only in our food, but also in the air we breathe and the water we drink, endangering water quality in wetlands, streams and rivers, and the fish and wildlife that depend on them.
- Increased use of herbicides on genetically engineered crops has led to herbicide-resistant "superweeds" that are infesting millions of acres of farmland and likely leading to the increased use of even more toxic chemicals.
- Genetically engineered foods are brought to you by the same chemical corporations that made Agent Orange and DDT—and promised they were safe even though they were not.
- Genetically engineered salmon—created in a laboratory using genes from an eel-like fish to grow abnormally fast and large—could soon have FDA approval to be sold unlabeled.
- Genetic contamination from genetically engineered crops threatens the livelihood of traditional and organic farmers, which is one of the reasons many of Oregon's family farmers support labeling.

The long-term effects of genetically engineered foods on our health and the environment are still being researched.

Citizens have the right to know important information about the food they eat. Labeling of genetically engineered foods will provide the information so that we all can make informed decisions about what we eat.

Join Oregon League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club and the Oregon Environmental Council in voting YES on Measure 92.

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

This law is working in 64 other countries and food costs have NOT gone up as a result.
It will work here, too.

The big chemical corporations that make and own genetically engineered food crops are spending millions to confuse and mislead Oregonians about food labeling.

They're doing what big corporations do:
Protect their own bottom line at any cost.

Even if that steps on your right to know what's in the food you eat and feed your family.

Do not be deceived.

Measure 92 is simple, straightforward, and provides clear information.

If a product has a food label now,
it's covered under Measure 92.

Who do you trust?

YES

Consumer advocate groups
Oregon family farmers
Food safety groups
Nurses, doctors and other medical professionals
Scientists
Restaurants across Oregon
Local grocery stores
Public employees
Conservation groups

NO

Big chemical and pesticide corporations

Get the facts and see the list of trusted groups and community leaders supporting YES on 92 at <http://oregonrighttoknow.org/>

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

YES ON MEASURE 92:

Oregonians have the right to know what's in the food we feed our families.

Labeling Has Big Benefits, NOT Big Costs

In 64 other countries around the world, genetically engineered foods are already labeled, and **FOOD COSTS DID NOT GO UP as a result.**

Measure 92 Is Straightforward and Clear

Food producers already label, so updating that label to include information about whether a food is genetically modified is straightforward to do. And so is this law—if a product has a food label now, it's covered under Measure 92.

Labeling Is About Information, Choice & Transparency

Food labels already contain information like ingredients, nutritional values and calorie content. Adding whether it contains genetically engineered foods simply provides Oregonians with the facts we need to make informed choices.

Big Corporations Are Trying to Confuse the Issue

Out-of-state chemical corporations that make and own genetically engineered food crops are spending millions trying to confuse voters about Measure 92. They don't care about Oregonians—they care about their own profits.

These are the same chemical companies that claimed Agent Orange was safe. That's not exactly the best track record for truth in advertising.

Urban and Rural Oregon—Support for Measure 92

"Certainly consumers deserve to know the actual ingredients they're eating."

-Baker City Herald Editorial ("Put Labels on GMO Foods," May 30, 2014)

"Labeling 'genetically engineered' food would empower consumers to make informed decisions about the food they buy."

-City Club of Portland ("Draft City Club Report Recommends 'Yes' Vote on GMO Labeling Ballot Measure," July 30, 2014)

Join consumer advocates, food safety groups, health care providers, thousands of family farmers, parents, restaurants & grocers in voting YES on 92.

Get the facts at <http://oregonrighttoknow.org/>.

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Labeling Genetically Engineered Foods Will NOT Increase Food Prices

As a former vice-president of the Grocery Manufacturers Association, I spent five years fighting against proposals that would have raised food prices, and I learned a lot about what drives the price of food.

I also saw firsthand that adding a few words to a label, as Measure 92 will do, has no impact on the price of making or selling food.

That's because food manufacturers are constantly changing their labels to highlight product innovations or to make health claims. Over the last decade, food manufacturers have introduced more than 20,000 healthier product choices. Changing labels is one of the primary ways that food companies let consumers know about these new features.

Adding the words "Produced With Genetic Engineering" will add as much to the cost of making food as adding the words "Can Help Reduce Cholesterol"—NOTHING.

Don't just take my word for it. Right now, 64 countries—including most of Europe and Japan—require genetically engineered foods to be labeled. Food prices in those countries did not rise when those laws went into effect.

That means U.S. food companies already label genetically engineered food shipped to half the world's population, giving families in other countries more information than they give to Americans.

And it's not driving up food costs one bit.

Nevertheless, the chemical companies that make billions selling genetically engineered foods claim that this measure will increase food prices—even though they know better.

Providing more information won't cost more, but it will give consumers the right to make choices for their families—just like they already have in 64 other nations.

Voting YES on Measure 92 creates transparency. We all have a right to know what's in the food we eat.

Scott Faber
Former vice-president of the Grocery Manufacturers Association

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Granges Support Measure 92:

"Labeling lets Oregonians know whether their food was grown by local family farmers, or engineered in a laboratory."

Our Granges have stood up for family farmers for generations, and family farms have been a critical part of Oregon's economy since our state was founded. But genetically engineered crops threaten the future of family farming.

One gust of wind, and pollen from a genetically engineered crop can blow onto farms miles away and cause major damage to farmers growing traditional crops.

This is not fair and it's not right.

That's why, earlier this year, Jackson and Josephine County farmers led the effort to ban genetically engineered crops in our communities.

With Oregon farm communities voting to ban genetically engineered crops, it seems like as a state we should at least label them.

Labeling will let Oregonians know whether their food is coming from family farmers growing traditional crops, or whether they are eating food that has been engineered in a laboratory and patented by an out-of-state chemical company.

The out-of-state chemical companies that own the patents on most genetically engineered foods will no doubt spend millions trying to mislead and confuse Oregonians with scare tactics about increased prices and harm to farmers. We know the truth firsthand—Measure 92 supports Oregon's family farmers.

Join our Granges in supporting Oregonians' right to know what we're eating, and giving people a tool to choose foods that don't put family farmers at risk.

Phoenix Grange #779
Jackson County, Oregon

Rockford Grange #501
Hood River County, Oregon

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Family Farmers across Oregon support Measure 92. We hope you'll stand with us.

Our Family Farms Coalition and Friends of Family Farmers represent more than 1000 Oregon family farms, and our organizations are dedicated to protecting family farmers.

Oregon farmers are proud of the food we grow, and believe our customers have the right to know if the food they buy has been genetically engineered.

As farmers, we come from all corners of Oregon—big family farms and little ones—but we all agree:

Labeling genetically engineered food is just good common sense.

Since scientists don't know all the effects of genetically engineered crops on the environment or our bodies, labeling lets people decide for themselves what to buy. Companies are already labeling food shipped to 64 countries that require it—and food costs haven't gone up there.

Labeling means you can tell the difference between foods that family farmers grow locally, and genetically engineered crops that out-of-state chemical corporations created in a lab. That's a difference that matters.

In Jackson County—one of the best seed-growing regions in the country—family farmers recently led a successful effort to ban genetically engineered crops because they contaminate traditional farmers' crops.

If Southern Oregon farmers voted to ban genetically engineered crops, we should at least label foods that contain them.

Chemical and pesticide companies are spending millions to scare and mislead voters. But they don't have the best interests of Oregonians in mind, and they don't speak for Oregon's family farmers.

Please stand with Oregon's family farmers by voting YES on 92.

Ivan Maluski, Director **Friends of Family Farmers**
Elise Higley, Director **Our Family Farms Coalition**
Jeff & Anna Boesch, Gold Hill
Steve Cohn, Talent
Eric George, Talent
Ryan Goodwin, Hood River
Chris Hardy, Ashland
Olivia Hittner, Rogue River
Laurie Hultquist, Talent
Jeff Jerome, Hood River

Kendra Kimbirauskas, Scio
Gigi Meyer, Bend
Aluna Michelle, Medford
Moria Reynolds, Hood River
Marc Valens, Beatty
Teri White, Rogue River
Chrissie Manion Zaerpoor, Yamhill

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Consumers Union, the Policy Arm of Consumer Reports: YES ON MEASURE 92

Labeling Provides Oregonians Needed Information to Make Informed Choices

Consumers Union, the policy arm of Consumer Reports, a non-profit product rating organization with approximately 8 million subscribers to its web and print editions, strongly urges Oregonians to vote YES on Measure 92.

CHECK THE FACTS: Labeling foods that are genetically engineered is a common-sense approach that gives consumers critical information.

The jury is still out on the long-term health effects and safety of genetically modified foods:

- There is virtually no independent safety testing of these foods in the United States, and we don't yet know the long-term health consequences of eating them.
- Studies that claim genetically engineered foods are safe in the United States are conducted by the same corporations that profit from their sale.
- The US does not require mandatory safety assessments—of potential allergens, toxins, nutritional changes and unexpected effects—before genetically engineered foods go on the market, unlike European countries.

U.S. companies are already labeling genetically modified foods being sent to other countries, and there is no evidence of increased food costs:

- Right now, 64 countries—including most of Europe, Australia and Japan—require genetically engineered foods to be labeled. There is no evidence that food prices rose in those countries when those laws went into effect.
- U.S. food companies already label genetically engineered food sent to half the world's population, giving families in other countries more information than they give to Americans. Consumers in the U.S. should have access to that same information.
- This law is straightforward to implement, as food producers can simply add this information to the labels that already tell us things like ingredients and calories.

Consumers shouldn't have to blindly trust chemical corporations about whether the food we're eating is safe.

A YES vote gives consumers more information, more control, and more choice. **That's why Consumers Union strongly supports Measure 92.**

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

"We used to grow genetically engineered crops. But when we learned how these crops threaten other farms, we stopped growing them."

Our family has farmed in southern Oregon since the 1800's and we now operate one of the largest farms in Jackson County.

For years, we grew genetically engineered crops. But after learning how these crops threaten our neighbors' farms

with contamination, we knew that going back to traditional farming was the right thing to do.

We support Measure 92 because it lets Oregonians know the difference between the traditional foods grown by most Oregon farmers, and the genetically engineered crops created in labs by out-of-state chemical companies.

Highlighting that difference may not be good for the big chemical companies, but it's good for Oregon farmers and it's good for Oregon families.

Did you know that 64 countries—including most European countries and Japan—require genetically engineered foods to be labeled? And food prices in those countries did not rise when those laws went into effect.

Earlier this year, over 170 family farms in Jackson and Josephine Counties came together to lead campaigns to protect family farmers from genetically engineered crops. The voters supported us overwhelmingly, and we no longer allow them to be grown in our counties. If Oregon farm communities voted to ban genetically engineered foods, as a state we should at least label them.

We're expecting our first child soon, and that's made us think even more about what's in our food. As farmers, we know this measure won't raise food prices. As soon-to-be parents, we have the right to know what we're feeding our family. So do you.

Please join us, and many other family farmers, in voting YES on Measure 92.

**Jared and Hannah Watters
Jackson County, OR**

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Support Oregon's Fishing Families Please Vote YES on Measure 92

My family has commercially fished for four generations. I'm proud to sell Oregon-caught salmon because I think it is some of the best fish in the world. I also know firsthand that the people who catch salmon risk their lives every time they leave the dock.

My family—and many other fishing families—have serious concerns about plans for genetically engineered salmon.

I'm voting YES on Measure 92 because labeling helps fishing families, by making sure people know the difference between the world-class salmon we fish, and salmon that's been engineered in a lab by an out-of-state corporation.

Protecting the health of our salmon is about more than preserving Oregon's natural heritage, it's also about preserving our livelihood and the health of Oregon's fishing economy.

Salmon is the first genetically engineered animal nearing FDA approval for people to eat. These fish are engineered in a laboratory to grow abnormally fast, using genes from an eel-like fish. Fisheries experts have been clear that if these engineered salmon escape it could have major impacts on wild salmon.

Without Measure 92, these genetically engineered fish could be sold without any notice to consumers.

Engineering fish and animals that people eat really crosses a line, and should at least be labeled.

Oregonians have a right to know what's in our food and should never be sold genetically engineered salmon when they think are buying real salmon caught by real fishermen and women.

Please stand with Oregon's fishing families—and all of our families' right to know what's in our food—rather than the out-of-state corporations who will say or do anything to protect their bottom line.

Please vote YES on Measure 92.

**Thank you,
Becky Thornberg
Astoria, Oregon**

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Whole Foods Market Supports Labeling Genetically Engineered Food

Measure 92 makes sure you know if food contains genetically engineered ingredients. You have a right to know what food you are buying.

We Label Lots of Things Already

Today, we label many things, from ingredients and allergens to country of origin. We even label whether juice is made from concentrate. This lets you make decisions for your family without judgment. There are lots of reasons consumers want information—health, religious, impact on the earth, and allergies among other reasons. Whatever your reason, only a label empowers you to make an informed decision.

Measure 92 is Simple

Measure 92 requires that raw or packaged food for human consumption says if it contains genetically engineered ingredients, just like Oregon's existing food labeling requirements do for milk containing bovine growth hormone. There is no new government structure. Restaurants that don't have to list ingredient information today won't be affected by Measure 92.

64 Countries Require Labeling

Today, 64 countries already require labeling. Companies fighting labeling in Oregon complied with labeling abroad. If labeling can be done in 64 countries, we should have that information in Oregon.

Labeling Doesn't Hurt Food Producers

Food producers routinely change labels every 12-15 months, for many reasons. Since labels are already frequently changing there is little cost to add information about genetically engineered ingredients. Markets are different across the country and reflect customer preferences—the exact same mayonnaise is Best Foods in the west and Hellman's back east. It's not a problem to label GMOs in Oregon.

Labeling Won't Raise Food Prices

Last year, General Mills made original Cheerios GMO-free and it's labeled such on the box. The price consumers paid for Cheerios did not go up. Nor did prices go up in countries that require labeling of genetically engineered food.

**Joe Rogoff, President
Whole Foods Market Pacific Northwest Region**

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Every Oregonian—regardless of income or food budget—has a right to know what's in the food we eat, and feed our families. Labeling is the only way we can truly know what's in our food.

Measure 92 is about information and **transparency, and control over our own food decisions.**

Food labels already contain important information like ingredients, nutritional values and calorie content. Adding to that label whether a product contains genetically engineered ingredients simply provides Oregonians with the facts we need to make informed choices about what we're eating.

The long-term health effects of genetically engineered foods are still unknown. The majority of genetically engineered crops are actually made by chemical companies like Monsanto and they are patented and owned by those companies so no independent studies are possible. The foods are created specifically to survive large doses of pesticides made by the very same companies.

Until we know the long-term health effects, we should label genetically engineered foods so every family can decide for themselves what to eat.

64 other countries—including most of Europe and Japan, China and Russia, require labeling of genetically engineered food. And the price of food did not go up after the laws were passed.

U.S. companies follow those laws when they ship food overseas. That means those food companies give more information to citizens of 64 other countries than they provide here. Oregonians deserve to get that same information.

Out-of-state chemical corporations are spending millions of dollars trying to confuse voters about this measure, because they are more interested in protecting their bottom line than in giving us basic information about the food we eat.

(This information furnished by Felisa Hagins, Political Director SEIU.)

Argument in Favor

Food & Water Watch Supports a YES Vote on Measure 92. It creates transparency so Oregonians can make informed decisions about what they eat and feed their families.

Oregonians have a right to know what's in our food.

Sixty-four other countries already label genetically modified food, which means that **U.S. food companies are providing more information to consumers in Europe, Japan—even China and Russia—than they provide here in America.**

It's not right that the chemical corporations that make billions off the sales of genetically engineered foods are blocking our right to know if our food has been genetically engineered.

There are good reasons to have concerns:

- The same chemical corporations that made the herbicide Agent Orange and the insecticide DDT—and wrongfully promised they were safe—are now **genetically engineering food in a lab to survive huge doses of their dangerous herbicides.**
- **That means more toxic chemicals are being used on our food, and released into the air we breathe and the water we drink.** Since the introduction of genetically engineered crops, the amount of herbicides sprayed on our food has increased by over 500 million pounds.
- That hurts our air and water quality, and endangers fish and wildlife.
- Salmon—a symbol of Oregon's natural heritage and something we have worked to protect—is now being genetically engineered in a laboratory to grow abnormally fast, using genes from an eel-like fish. Nearing FDA approval, **this genetically engineered fish could be sold without a label.**
- We need to be really careful when we start messing with nature. **Engineering animals that people eat crosses a line. It should at least be labeled.**

Labeling GMO foods will assist Oregonians who are concerned about the potential effects of chemicals used to raise their food to make informed purchasing decisions.

Please join Food & Water Watch in voting YES to label genetically engineered foods, so Oregonians can decide for themselves.

(This information furnished by Julia B DeGraw, Food & Water Watch.)

Argument in Favor

Central Oregon Rancher Supports Labeling Genetically Engineered Foods

On our family's Central Oregon ranch we are proud of the meat we raise and we are proud of how we raise it. When our customers buy our meat, they can trust that it's good for them. For ranchers like us, keeping that trust is critical to our success.

As ranchers, we support Measure 92 because every Oregonian has the right to know what they're eating, and the right to decide whether to avoid meat, fish and other foods that have been genetically engineered in a lab.

You only need to read about the development of genetically engineered beef in China, or the FDA's expected approval of genetically engineered salmon, to realize that Oregonians have more reasons than ever to want to know what we're eating. Labeling will give people that information.

If China's genetically engineered beef comes to Oregon, ranchers like me need to make sure people will have the information to tell the difference between meat that has been raised honestly and something that's been genetically engineered in a far-off laboratory.

It's unfortunate to hear the political spin trying to confuse Oregonians about how Measure 92 would apply to meat and dairy products.

From this rancher's perspective, it's pretty simple: Measure 92 requires labeling of meat or dairy products if they have been produced from an animal that is genetically engineered.

Please join our ranch in supporting Oregonians' right to know what's in our food by voting YES on Measure 92.

**Alan Rousseau, Pine Mountain Ranch
Bend, Oregon**

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

New Seasons Market Encourages a YES Vote on Measure 92

Genetically engineered food should be labeled because people have a right to know what is in the food we eat and feed our families.

At New Seasons Market, **we are passionate about providing our customers with transparent information so they can make good choices for themselves and their families.** That is why we are supporting **YES on Measure 92** that will require labeling of genetically engineered food.

New Seasons Market was founded on the belief that **people want to be in control of their food choices and to have the information they need to make the choices that are right for them.**

We believe in empowering our customers with options and transparent information. This is why we were early advocates for improving standards by requiring natural and organic labeling. It is why we partnered with the Non-GMO Project and carry nearly 4,000 Non-GMO Project Verified products, and why we are endorsing **YES on Measure 92**, which requires labeling of genetically engineered food.

As a local grocer who works directly with numerous farmers

and food producers, we believe the requirements for our industry are reasonable.

Ultimately, we believe that Measure 92 will be good for consumers, giving Oregonians the information we all need to make informed choices about the food we eat, and feed our families.

**Your Food.
Your Choice.
Your Vote.**

(This information furnished by Wendy Collie, New Seasons Market.)

Argument in Favor

Moms Across Oregon Agree:

We have a right to the peace of mind that comes with knowing what's in the food we feed our families.

There are so many things out of our control these days—from who our kids interact with online, to their safety as teens, to worrying about making ends meet.

One thing we can control is what's in the food that nurtures our families. And that's what Measure 92 is all about.

Labeling genetically engineered food gives us **information, options and the ability to decide for ourselves** and our families. That's something every parent needs and deserves.

Food labels already contain important information like ingredients, nutritional values and calorie content. Adding to that label whether it contains genetically engineered foods simply provides us with the facts we need to make informed choices.

We don't yet know the long-term health effects of genetically engineered foods made to withstand high doses of pesticides. Hopefully, they will prove to be safe, but **until we know the long-term health effects, we should label genetically engineered foods** so every family can determine what works for them.

In a world where a lot can happen that's out of our control, **Measure 92 offers parents a little peace of mind that we get to make informed choices** about the food that nurtures our families.

Please join us—and thousands of other parents across Oregon—in voting YES on Measure 92.

Lynn Barton, Medford
Carissa Bonham, Hillsboro
Dahviya Davis, Portland
Mary Ellen De Luca, Talent
Erin Dye, Prineville
Maria Edwards, Medford
Marlee Jane Gustine, Williams
Shannon Hill, North Bend
Beth Hoezee, Hood River
Mariah Leung, Eugene
Cheryl Levie, Ashland
Eden Luz, Applegate Valley
Kristina Marlia, Medford
Susan Peik, Portland
Nicole Peltz, Eugene
Kimberly Kaminski, Portland
Emily Reed, Mosier
Carrie Twigg, Portland
Linda Zielinski, Philomath
Elsan Zimmerman, Florence

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

Jackson County scientist urges a YES vote on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.

As a senior EPA scientist (now retired), I wrote the U.S. government's first research plan to study safety issues of genetically engineered organisms including crops. I know a lot about these organisms, and I have deep concerns about their impact on our environment and long-term health.

Just this spring, my home of Southern Oregon's Rogue Valley—one of the top agricultural regions in the nation—voted overwhelmingly to ban genetically engineered crops because of the harm they do. This effort was led by Jackson County farmers, local businesses and a broad spectrum of Oregonians concerned about protecting local family farms.

If Southern Oregon citizens came together to ban genetically modified crops, we should at least label them.

Decades ago, chemical companies produced DDT and Agent Orange, and insisted they were safe. Independent science proved otherwise.

The vast majority of genetically engineered crops are designed to tolerate high doses of herbicides. This has led to a huge increase in the use of these chemicals, which end up in our food, in our water, in our bodies, and create serious ecological harm.

Insecticide use has increased 10-fold in the last 10 years, according to recent U.S. Government reports. **The fact is that we don't yet know the long-term health effects of genetically engineered crops that receive higher and higher doses of pesticides every year.**

That's why 21 prominent scientists—including long-standing members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—have raised "significant concerns" about safety, and said that opposition to labeling efforts, "tramples the rights of consumers to make informed choices." ("Scientists reject decision by AAAS board to oppose GMO labeling," GM Watch, November 2, 2012)

Until we know for sure, we should label these foods so consumers can make informed choices about what they eat.

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

**City Club of Portland Recommends a Yes Vote
Transparency and Truth in Labeling Food**

What does this measure do?

Genetically engineered food is produced using a technique which inserts the genes from one organism into the genetic material of another.

The measure would require labeling of genetically engineered (GE) food that contains 0.9 percent or greater of genetically engineered material. It would exclude alcohol, food served in restaurants, and animal products.

Why has this been proposed?

GE labeling will give consumers information and has an added potential benefit of helping research on the long-term effects of GE food.

Why vote Yes?

Consumers should have the right to make informed choices. Sixty-four nations have adopted genetically engineered food labeling laws in some form, including all member states of the European Union, India, Japan, China, Brazil, and Russia. Many of these countries use the 0.9 percent threshold for labeling, which is the threshold proposed here.

Labeling products will allow us to track GE products if either suspected or documented health issues arise in the future. GE products haven't been on the market for long

enough to see health and safety effects, and future GE products could raise concerns we have not yet considered. Consumers who prefer to use caution have the right to avoid GE products but cannot without labeling.

There are legitimate immediate environmental concerns that the widespread use of Roundup in conjunction with herbicide-tolerant GE crops have accelerated herbicide-resistant weeds ("superweeds"), leaving substantial stretches of farmland unsuitable for farming. The use of GE in high concentrations has accelerated the process and consumers who wish to avoid these products should have the option to do so.

City Club Members Vote:

Yes 77%

No 23%

Who is City Club of Portland?

We bring together civic-minded people to make Portland and Oregon better places to live, work and play for everyone. Read our measure report and become a City Club member at:

www.pdxcityclub.org

(This information furnished by Karen Kervin, President, City Club of Portland.)

Argument in Favor

There is something I learned about genetically engineered food that I think all Oregonians deserve to know.

There are sixty-four other countries—including most of Europe, Japan, Australia, and even China (just to name a few)—that already require labeling of genetically engineered foods.

That's right. **Sixty-four countries already label genetically engineered food.**

And do you know how much food costs have gone up as a result?

Zero. Not at all. Costs haven't gone up.

So when corporations start spending millions—claiming that labeling is going to make their food more expensive—I'm sure not going to take their word for it. In fact, many of the same corporations fighting a U.S. standard for labeling GMOs already label their products overseas.

I'm voting YES on Measure 92, because **these corporations will say, do, or spend anything to protect their own bottom line and to keep us in the dark.**

Because the evidence shows that food costs don't go up just because you give people more information and more choice.

And, because **Oregonians have a right to know what's in our food.**

Congressman Peter DeFazio

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY

&

OREGON PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY:

YES ON 92

**BECAUSE WE HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW
WHAT'S IN OUR FOOD**

THE PROBLEM

Although more than 80% of processed foods are produced using genetic engineering, these products are not required to be labeled. Lack of mandatory labeling of genetically

engineered food prevents consumers from making informed food choices. Consumers have a right to know how their food is produced, especially when these foods may pose environmental and health risks.

WHY THIS INFORMATION MATTERS

The government does not independently test genetically engineered foods for safety, and no independent long-term studies have established that genetically engineered foods are safe. Further, mounting evidence indicates that genetically engineered foods may harm our environment and health.

- Crops engineered to tolerate herbicide exposure create herbicide-resistant weeds that require farmers to use larger quantities of toxic pesticides.
- Over the last decade, since genetically engineered crops have become prevalent, 400 million extra pounds of pesticides were sprayed on our food and released into our air and water.
- Pesticide exposure is linked to many health issues, including cancer, neurological disorders, endocrine disruption, and birth defects. As exposure increases, so do negative health outcomes, particularly for our farmworker communities.

MEASURE 92 IS ABOUT TRANSPARENCY

Many Oregonians have health or environmental concerns about genetically engineered foods. Others object to genetically engineered foods, and especially genetically engineered animals, such as salmon, on ethical grounds. Labels provide important facts we need in order to make informed choices.

GMO LABELING DOESN'T INCREASE PRICES

Around the world, 64 countries—including all European Union nations, Australia, Japan, and Brazil—require labeling of GE foods. American food companies already comply with those nations' laws to sell internationally, and prices have not increased as a result.

Like citizens in 64 other countries, all Americans, including Oregonians, deserve the opportunity to make informed decisions about their food.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON MEASURE 92.

(This information furnished by Susan Katz, MD, Board President, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility.)

Argument in Favor

**Regardless of Income,
Everyone Has the Right to Know
What's in Our Food**

There are a lot of crazy claims being made about Measure 92 that are meant to scare people like us—seniors on a fixed income.

We watch every penny when it comes to buying food, but healthy food is important to us. As you consider Measure 92, we hope you'll consider this:

All Oregonians, regardless of their income, deserve to know what is in their food.

That's why we are voting Yes on Measure 92.

Plans to start selling genetically engineered fish and meat have us especially concerned and it's not right that stores could start selling these products to people without letting them know.

Don't be fooled by the chemical corporations that own most genetically engineered crops. They claim that a simple label letting people know if food at the grocery store is genetically engineered would increase foods prices.

It just isn't true and they are trying to scare voters.

There are 64 countries around the world that label genetically

engineered food. But the corporations can't point to a single country where labeling has increased food prices.

We've also heard the corporations that oppose Measure 92 saying that if we want to know whether our food has been genetically engineered, we should just buy organic or the few specialty foods that are labeled as free of genetically engineered ingredients.

But many Oregonians, such as seniors and low-income families, can't afford to buy organic or specialty foods. **Don't we deserve the same information as people who have more resources?**

Food labeling is the only way to ensure that all Oregonians can access the same information about what we're eating and feeding our families. Please vote Yes on 92.

Karen Revell & Michael Welsh
Medford, Oregon

(This information furnished by Paige Richardson, Vote Yes on Measure 92: We have the right to know what's in our food.)

Argument in Favor

**Healthy Families
Are Nurtured With Healthy Food**

**That's why the Oregon Nurses Association—
representing more than 12,000 nurses across Oregon—
recommends a "YES" vote on Measure 92.**

As nurses, we take our mission of helping families make healthy choices very seriously. When it comes to the food we eat—and feed our families—making healthy choices means having all the facts:

How many calories are in this food? What are the ingredients? Does it contain any products that have been genetically engineered?

Right now, Oregonians can answer those first two questions by reading the label of any food we buy. However, Oregonians are denied the information to know if our food has been genetically engineered.

Oregon nurses believe that Oregonians have a right to know what is in the food we eat and feed our families.

- We are concerned that long-term studies do not exist for genetically engineered foods—so **we don't yet know its long-term health effects.** There are too many examples of chemicals, drugs and other products that corporations claimed were safe, but long-term scientific studies later proved to be risky or downright unsafe.
- Sixty-four other countries, including most of Europe, Australia and Japan, already label genetically engineered food. **U.S. food companies label food for consumers in these other countries; they should do the same for us.**
- Long-term studies may eventually show genetic engineering to be safe. But until we have all the facts, it's common sense to label genetically engineered foods so Oregonians can decide for themselves.

**Please join Oregon's nurses
in voting YES on Measure 92,
so Oregonians have the opportunity
to make informed and healthy choices.**

Alan Helyer, RN, MPH, MBA
Oregon Nurses Association

(This information furnished by Sarah C. Baessler, Oregon Nurses Association.)

Argument in Opposition

NAACP of Corvallis/Albany opposes 92 Hurts Oregon families struggling to make ends meet

Oregon's proposed experiment with a flawed GE labeling system will come at a cost. And that cost will fall hardest on those in our state least able to afford it.

Over five years after the Great Recession officially ended, too many Oregon families are still struggling. Good jobs are tough to find and the recovery has not yet reached many impoverished communities – **particularly communities of color.**

Measure 92 will increase food costs for Oregon families – especially hurting those who can least afford it.

With the hardship of the downturn not even in rear view mirror for many, now is not the time to increase food costs for working families. Yet, that is exactly what Measure 92 will do.

Study after study has confirmed that single-state labeling schemes like Measure 92 will add at least \$400 a year to the average family's annual grocery bill.

Families living paycheck to paycheck will be forced to make tough choices like picking cheaper, less healthy foods, cutting portions or skipping meals to make ends meet. This will be particularly felt in rural Oregon where there is limited access to fresh, affordable foods and higher transportation costs. We appreciate that many Oregonians prefer GMO-free food and they have thousands of options to choose these foods by selecting the "organic" or "non-gmo" label.

The economic impact of Measure 92 on Oregon families living in poverty cannot be overstated. Today the federal government estimates that over 500,000 Oregonians lack consistent access to adequate amounts of nutritious food. Let's not sacrifice their welfare to impose a law that increases the cost of food.

Please look into the facts and join us in voting No on Measure 92.

Barry Jerkins, President
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,
Corvallis/Albany

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Professor of Plant Science: Measure 92 won't tell consumers which foods contain GMOs

Labels can inform or mislead. Consumers expect food labels to be reliable and meaningful. That won't be the case with Measure 92.

Measure 92 is so poorly written that under its requirements thousands of foods would have to be labeled as "genetically engineered" (GE) even if they have no GE content. And, thousands of other foods would be exempt from labeling even if they were made with or contain GE ingredients, or are produced from animals that ate GMO feed. In fact, about 2/3 of foods that Oregonians consume would be exempt from Measure 92's labeling requirements.

In addition, the labels required by Measure 92 would **not** tell consumers which ingredients in a packaged food product are GMOs, or what percentage of the product is GMO ingredients (if any).

Measure's 92's Oregon-only labeling system would reduce rather than increase consumer choice, and it would make our food more expensive. The increased cost isn't in the label. It's in remaking the product, removing GE ingredients or sourcing more expensive non-GE alternatives.

Our existing nationwide labeling systems already provide consumers with a reliable way to choose products that are made with non-GMO ingredients, if that's what they prefer. Consumers can already choose from literally thousands of products in thousands of stores that are labeled "organic" or "non-GMO." These are two of the fastest growing market segments in food products.

Measure 92 conflicts with these national standards that already provide better options for consumers who prefer to avoid GMOs.

I fully support efforts to provide information to Oregonians about our food and its safety, and I have been active in doing that through teaching and outreach for many years. However, this inaccurate labeling scheme would mislead rather than inform.

Dr. Steven H. Strauss, plant scientist
Distinguished Professor
Oregon State University
Corvallis

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 92 diverts taxpayer money that could be better spent on our schools. One teacher's concerns about Measure 92.

As a teacher, I'm painfully aware of how slowly our Oregon economy has been recovering from the Great Recession. It's taken a toll on school budgets across the state, including where I work as an associate principal.

While Oregon struggles to fund our schools adequately, it makes no sense to spend money on two new bureaucracies to oversee a badly written labeling law that won't provide consumers with accurate or reliable information.

Measure 92 creates an Oregon-only food labeling program and directs two state agencies to develop rules and enforce it. Oregon Department of Administrative Services staff (*DAS memo, July 18, 2014*) estimated that routine inspection-based enforcement would require \$2.75 million in start-up costs and more than \$14 million for each two-year budget. It places no limit on what the program could ultimately cost taxpayers.

In addition to misdirecting taxpayer dollars, Measure 92 will increase food bills for Oregon families. The State Legislative Revenue Office wrote to the Financial Estimate Committee that "consumer/producer responses and **the additional costs associated with labeling are expected to increase overall food prices within the state.**" (*LRO memo on Measure 92, August 21, 2014*)

Consumers are right to want information about the foods we buy and feed our families. But we should expect food labels to be accurate and reliable. Measure 92 doesn't provide that. It exempts 2/3 of the foods we buy – including food served in school cafeterias, and meat, milk and eggs from animals raised on GMO grain. And Measure 92 would require labels on many foods that don't contain *any* GMOs.

Measure 92 is flawed and costly. Let's spend our taxpayer funds on better schools, not a bad labeling system.

Please vote NO on 92.

Kraig J. Hoene
Associate High School Principal
Linn County

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 92 costly for families, provides misleading information

Measure 92 creates an unreliable labeling system that will increase the cost of groceries for Oregon families.

As a mother, I read labels carefully to ensure I'm feeding my family healthy foods. As consumers we all depend on labels to provide accurate and reliable information so we can make informed choices.

2/3 of foods would be exempt from labeling.

Measure 92 is so badly written that it won't tell consumers which products contain GMOs and which don't. The measure exempts two-thirds of the foods and beverages sold in our state, *even if they are made with GMOs*. And it would require thousands of foods to be labeled as "genetically engineered" even if the foods don't have any GMO content. This creates an unreliable labeling system that won't provide consumers with accurate information about what's in our food. And Measure 92 won't tell consumers which ingredients are GE (if any) or what percentage of the product is GE.

Meat and dairy products would also be exempt from labeling even if they come from animals that have been fed genetically engineered grain or injected with GE drugs.

Measure 92 will increase grocery costs for Oregon families.

The costs of complying with Measure 92's requirements would increase food costs. Studies in Washington, California and New York estimated that labeling requirements like Measure 92's would increase grocery costs for a family of four by over \$450 per year. This is because food companies would have to track and specially label their products just for Oregon – or remake them with higher priced ingredients to comply. These costs will be passed on to consumers.

Measure 92 is flawed and costly. We can do better for Oregon families.

Vote NO on Measure 92.

Anne Marie Gurney
Portland

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Retail Council Recommends a NO Vote

Oregon is a small business state. We're proud to bring innovation, entrepreneurship and jobs to our communities.

After careful study, our members concluded Measure 92 would increase costs for Oregon's small businesses. Worse, it would mislead consumers who support labeling GMOs because it won't reliably tell people which foods contain GMOs and which don't.

Complex requirements are costly and burdensome.

Measure 92 will add costs to the food production system – and that will increase grocery costs for families. Everyone from farmer to retailer would be required to create extensive record-keeping systems to document every step in the supply chain.

The process is not only onerous and expensive, especially for small family farms and small businesses, but it also adds liability costs for producers, processors and retailers and puts Oregon farmers and food producers at a competitive disadvantage, having to meet extreme requirements that exist only in our state.

All consumers, small businesses and farmers should be treated equally

Measure 92's Oregon-only requirements conflict with federal standards and are unfair to Oregon farmers, businesses, taxpayers and consumers. Food labeling regulations should

be set at the federal level to ensure fairness for consumers, farmers and food producers.

Measure 92 won't give consumers reliable information

Perhaps the most important reason to vote NO on Measure 92 is that it won't give consumers reliable information about which foods contain GMO ingredients and which do not. It also won't provide any information about which ingredients may be GMOs or what percentage of the product may include GMO content, if any. *[Measure 92 Section 5 (4)]*

Oregonians deserve better. Vote NO on Measure 92.

Elizabeth Earls
Oregon Retail Council

(This information furnished by Elizabeth Earls, Director, Oregon Retail Council.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 92 Will Hurt Oregon Fruit Growers

My family has been growing fruit in Hood River since 1919. Duckwall Fruit began back then as two brothers shipping apples to Indiana. Now generations of my family have grown our small family business into an operation that packs over two million cartons of pears grown by over 70 growers on 115 separate farms every year.

Our company, farmers, growers and other agricultural family businesses throughout Oregon will suffer if Measure 92 is passed even though we do not grow GMO crops.

Our pears are shipped all over the world and are used as ingredients in foods and beverages here in Oregon and elsewhere.

Measure 92 would require us and every party in the food supply chain to track every step of production, packing, handling and transporting to provide "sworn statements" declaring that food ingredients, like our pears, have not been produced or handled with any GMO crops. Farmers, retailers and manufacturers would be exposed to lawsuits, fines and even criminal penalties if a food product is wrongly labeled.

A lawsuit against a product using our fruit could put our entire business in the crosshairs. Agricultural life is tough and very few of us have the time or money to deal with shake-down lawsuits.

Measure 92's increased regulatory red tape and bookkeeping for farmers and growers will hurt Oregon businesses and agriculture and put us at a competitive disadvantage.

We take pride in helping the world taste Oregon pears and we are equally proud of our economic role through our partnership with local growers and farmers. Should Measure 92 pass, wearing both of those hats will become significantly more difficult. Oregon businesses, growers, taxpayers and consumers will be hurt.

Please consider the future of those with their hands in the soil and vote NO on Measure 92.

Fred Duckwall, Duckwall Fruit
Hood River

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Associated Oregon Industries opposes Measure 92 Bad for small businesses

The state's largest business association, representing 1,400 Oregon businesses, **opposes** Measure 92 because it is a complex and misleading initiative that would create huge new costs and complicated red tape for farmers, food companies

and grocery stores in our state. It would also cost Oregon taxpayers millions and increase grocery costs for Oregon families. All for a flawed labeling system that won't tell consumers which foods are made with GMOs and which are not.

Hurts family farmers and small businesses

Small businesses are the backbone of our state's economy. Many of these businesses are the food producers, retailers and family farmers hit hardest by Measure 92. Its extreme requirements put our state's businesses at a competitive disadvantage. And it would authorize a new class of "shake-down" lawsuits against farmers, food producers and retailers over any alleged violation of its requirements.

Costly to consumers

Several recent studies concluded that single-state labeling proposals like Measure 92 would drive up grocery costs by hundreds of dollars *per year per family*. Food companies would have to relabel or repackage their food—just for our state—unless products are remade with higher priced ingredients. Complying with Measure 92's complex regulations will increase costs for food producers, forcing them to pass these costs on to consumers.

Two new government bureaucracies

Measure 92 is costly to taxpayers as well. It creates two new government bureaucracies to oversee its complex requirements and write new regulations, with no limit on how much taxpayer money can be spent to enforce these new regulations.

Existing food labels already give consumers the option to choose foods made without GE ingredients if that's what they prefer, by choosing "organic" or "non-GMO" labels. Measure 92 conflicts with these national standards.

Measure 92 is flawed and costly.

It deserves a NO vote.

(This information furnished by Jay M. Clemens, President & CEO.)

Argument in Opposition

Former Grant County Judge sheds light on the flaws of Measure 92

As a former Judge for Grant County, I understand laws and regulations and how they can help or hurt citizens and the industries they work in.

Industries like agriculture, timber, and ranching are literal life-lines for much of rural Oregon and we *must* think about how new policies will impact those sectors before we adopt them.

Make no mistake -- Measure 92 is not what it seems and instead is bad policy that will hurt the industries that help drive our rural economies.

It's a nice-sounding initiative that proponents say is simple and straightforward. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Measure 92's Oregon-only requirements are complex and extreme. It is harmful to Oregon's farmers, food producers and agriculture community.

- Farmers, retailers and manufacturers would be exposed to lawsuits, fines and even criminal penalties for any "misbranding" of food products. I know the legal system and how costly it can be to defend one's self even against a false claim. Measure 92 goes out of its way to put family farmers in legal crosshairs to enforce its requirements. The measure even allows for a prevailing plaintiff to recover attorney's fees, but makes no provision for prevailing defendants, such as farmers. This is utterly unfair.
- Measure 92's complex requirements would only exist in Oregon – putting our farmers and food producers at a competitive disadvantage.
- Measure 92 creates a labeling scheme that specifically mandates that some foods with no GMO content would

be labeled while two-thirds of the foods Oregonians consume would get special exemptions and would not be subject to labeling rules.

This measure is bad policy for our state, and will hurt farmers, consumers and taxpayers. I urge Oregon voters to study the facts and reject Measure 92.

The Honorable Mark Webb
Former Grant County Judge

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 92: A Bad Idea for Oregon's Family Farmers and Consumers

Measure 92 would impose a new costly and inaccurate labeling scheme on food sold in Oregon. The Measure would drive up food prices without giving Oregonians the information they need to make informed choices.

Will Not Give Consumers Accurate Information

Under the Measure, some foods with genetically modified ingredients would be labeled – but others wouldn't. All food sold in restaurants or packaged as ready to eat would be exempt. So would meat and dairy products from animals raised on genetically engineered feed. At the same time, many products that are free of genetically engineered ingredients would still be forced to carry the label unless the producers incur the expense of a costly verification system.

Will Increase Food Prices for Oregon Families

Complying with the measure will come at a cost, and it will be substantial. As farmers and food producers are forced to purchase new tracking and reporting systems to comply with the law, and substitute higher-priced, non-GE ingredients in many products, these costs will be passed on to consumers. Numerous studies have shown that a family of four will pay at least an additional \$400 a year for groceries as a result.

Will Hurt Oregon's Family Farms

The measure's regulations and requirements would put Oregon farmers at a disadvantage compared to those in Washington, Idaho, and elsewhere. Oregon farmers are leaders in sustainable, responsible practices and yet this measure would punish them and make it harder for them to compete.

There are already existing labeling systems in place for consumers to choose foods made without GMO ingredients, by choosing foods labeled "organic" or "non-GMO." These labels are based on national standards and are more reliable than Measure 92's flawed approach.

Please vote No on Measure 92.

Oregonians for Food and Shelter

(This information furnished by Scott Dahlman, Executive Director - Oregonians for Food and Shelter.)

Argument in Opposition

Oregon Farm Bureau urges voters to reject Measure 92

Oregon Farm Bureau, representing 7,500 farmers in Oregon, strongly **opposes** Measure 92.

This measure would hurt thousands of Oregon family farmers and small store owners, cost taxpayers millions for new government bureaucracy, and increase grocery bills for Oregon families by hundreds of dollars every year – all for a flawed food labeling system that won't give consumers reliable information about the foods we buy.

This labeling system would only exist in Oregon and its burdensome requirements would put our growers at a

competitive disadvantage compared with those in other states.

Limits opportunity for advancements and growth

Measure 92 will increase our costs of production and limit our ability to compete with farmers in neighboring states. Oregon Farm Bureau is committed to keeping Oregon farmers as leaders in producing healthy, abundant crops to feed the country and the world.

Measure 92 threatens options for the future and will be harmful to Oregon families. It doesn't provide consumers with accurate or reliable information on food labels, but it does carry tremendous costs.

Shakedown lawsuits would hurt small family farmers

Measure 92 creates a special new right to sue any farmer who operates a farm stand or makes food products to "enforce" its labeling requirements. This exposes farmers and food producers to costly new liabilities.

Conflicts with federal standards

Labeling standards should be set at the federal level so that all farmers, food producers and consumers are treated equally. Measure 92's Oregon-only labeling requirements conflict with the existing national standards that already provide more reliable information for consumers.

A broad coalition of farmers and agricultural organizations across the state are urging a NO vote on Measure 92. Please stand with family farmers and reject this poorly written initiative.

Please join us in voting NO on 92.

Barry Bushue, President, Oregon Farm Bureau
3rd generation family farmer
Boring

(This information furnished by Barry Bushue, President, Oregon Farm Bureau.)

Argument in Opposition

Measure 92 Won't Give Families The Information They Want

Helping families with health choices is a critical component of a physician's job. Beyond treating the problem in front of us, we give advice and recommendations about how individuals and families can maintain and improve their long-term health.

I am voting NO on Measure 92 because it will make it harder for families to make informed food choices.

Many food labels would be outright false under Measure 92

As a doctor, I am trained to deliver *accurate* information that is *clearly* understood by patients. Measure 92 does not live up to those standards. A shopper looking to purchase only non-GMO food will have a hard time doing so under Measure 92, because it exempts from labeling two-thirds of the foods purchased by Oregonians.

Consumers are better served under existing labeling system

Existing nationwide labeling systems already provide consumers a more reliable way to choose foods without genetically engineered ingredients, if that's what they prefer, by selecting foods labeled "organic" or "non-GMO." These are reliable national standards and do not have the inconsistencies and special exemptions of Measure 92.

There is no scientific basis for Measure 92's labeling requirements

According to the American Medical Association, there is no scientific justification for special labeling of GE foods. Over 700 peer-reviewed scientific studies over the past 20 years have shown GE foods are safe and nutritionally identical to their conventional counterparts. As a consequence, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration doesn't support the mandatory labeling of GE foods as required by Measure 92.

It is a physician's job to help patients separate myth from fact and **Measure 92 suffers from a deficiency of fact.**

Please look into the facts and vote NO on Measure 92.

George Waldmann, M.D.
Family practice
Portland

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

Korean-American Grocers Association of Oregon urges NO on 92

Will Increase Food Costs and Hurt Small Businesses

The Korean-American Grocers Association of Oregon represents 234 small, family-owned businesses throughout our state. Our customers are our neighbors and friends and we pride ourselves on providing a variety and selection of food products at reasonable prices.

We oppose Measure 92 because it will increase food costs for our customers and unfairly impact small, family-owned businesses, putting Oregon small retailers like our members at a competitive disadvantage and exposing business owners to costly lawsuits, fines and penalties. In addition, Measure 92 will not provide consumers with accurate or reliable information on food labels.

Grocery costs are a critical concern to our customers and increases in food costs have an enormous impact on families in our community and throughout our state. Measure 92 will increase costs for farmers, food producers and retailers and these costs will be passed on to our customers. Low income and fixed income families will suffer the greatest.

Food producers—even those in other states and countries—would have to put special labels on their products or remake them with more expensive, organic or non-GMO ingredients just for Oregon. These requirements will result in less consumer choice and fewer products being available for sale in our state. The costs of product tracking and documentation and the risks of costly lawsuits and penalties further threaten our businesses.

Measure 92 is a costly, flawed food labeling system that is bad for Oregon consumers and businesses.

Please join us in voting NO on 92.

Korean-American Grocers Association of Oregon

(This information furnished by Pat McCormick, NO on 92 Coalition.)

Argument in Opposition

NW Food Processors Association opposes Measure 92

Measure 92 would increase food costs in our state and provide Oregon consumers with unreliable and inaccurate food labeling information. It's a poorly written initiative that fails on its fundamental promise to help consumers make more informed choices.

Oregon food processors are among the thousands of food companies and farmers that would be saddled with the costly and burdensome requirements of Measure 92. This would make food products more expensive — without providing any health or safety benefits to consumers, and *without providing accurate or reliable information on food labels.*

For example, under Measure 92 products distributed to grocery stores and products delivered to restaurants would be labeled differently, even if they are the exact same product.

Under Measure 92, food producers would be required to specially label thousands of products just for Oregon – unless these products are remade with more expensive, specially-handled ingredients just to be sold in our state. Either way, Oregon consumers lose. Measure 92 would mean unreliable, inaccurate food labels for consumers and higher food costs for Oregon families.

Most importantly, Measure 92 will not provide consumers with accurate or reliable information. That's because the measure is so poorly written that it would require thousands of food products to be labeled as "genetically engineered," even though they may not be. In addition, two-thirds of the foods we buy in Oregon would be exempt from labelling requirements, so consumers won't have a reliable way of knowing which products contain GE content or are made with GE ingredients and which are not.

The safety of customers, accuracy in food labeling and supplying consumers with reliable information is paramount to Oregon food producers. Measure 92 would provide consumers inaccurate information about the foods we buy and end up costing us all.

(This information furnished by Ian Tolleson, Director of Government Affairs, Northwest Food Processors Association.)



Resources for Voters with Disabilities

Contact **your county elections office** or call **1 866 673 8683** to request these resources.

Alternate Format Ballots

- **HTML ballot**, available to voters who are unable to mark a printed ballot. Voters can vote in the privacy of their own home using their own accessible tools. Voters who do not have accessible tools at home may vote the HTML ballot using a **tablet computer**. An accessible computer station is located in every county elections office.
- **Large print ballot**, available to voters with low vision.

Alternate Format Voting Guides

- **Statewide Voters' Pamphlet**, available in digital audio or accessible text at www.oregonvotes.gov. Request a CD of mp3 format audio files by phone.
- **Easy Voters' Guide**, available in digital audio or accessible text at www.voteoregon.org/voterinformation/voters-guides. English and Spanish versions are available in print.
- **Standard Voters' Guide**, available in digital audio or accessible text www.voteoregon.org/voterinformation/voters-guides. Large Print, Braille, CD and NSL compatible versions also are available. Contact Talking Book and Braille Services at **1 800 452 0292** to request this voting guide.

Additional Resources

- **Large print voter registration card**, available to voters with low vision.
- **Signature Stamp Attestation Card**. If, because of a disability, a person is unable to sign a ballot or registration card, they may use a signature stamp or other indicator that represents their signature. A signature stamp attestation form must be completed along with an updated (or new) voter registration card.

Voters Assistance

Contact **your county elections office** or call **1 866 673 8683** to request these resources.

I need assistance to vote

Any voter with a disability can request assistance to register to vote, vote their ballot and/or return their ballot. You can also request assistance from a caretaker, care provider or someone else you choose.

I want to assist a voter

Your county elections office can suggest resources you can use to help inform voters. Resources must be nonpartisan and unbiased.

Who can provide assistance?

- A County Voting Assistance Team
 - A Facility Voting Assistance Team
 - Someone chosen by the voter
-

Who cannot provide assistance?

- The voter's employer
 - An agent of the voter's employer
 - A union officer or agent of a union of which the voter is a member
-

What is a facility voting assistance team?

A **congregate living facility** may form a Facility Assistance Team to assist voters living in their facility.

Teams must be made up of **two registered voters** that do not have the same political party affiliation.

Registering to Vote

To vote in Oregon you need to be registered in the county where you reside.

You can register if you can answer yes to these three questions:

- Are you a resident of Oregon?
- Are you a US citizen?
- Are you at least 17 years of age?

If you are 17 years of age, you will not receive a ballot until an election occurs on or after your 18th birthday.

How to register

You can register to vote online at www.oregonvotes.gov or you can get a voter registration card at any of the following places:

- in this voters' pamphlet
- any county elections office
- the Secretary of State's Office
- some state agencies such as the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
- a voter registration drive

You can fill the card out in person or send it in by US mail.

You can also print out a registration card online at: www.oregonvotes.gov.

To vote in the November 4, 2014, General Election, your completed voter registration card must be either:

- postmarked by Tuesday, October 14, 2014,
- delivered to a county elections office by Tuesday, October 14, 2014, or
- delivered to any voter registration agency (e.g., DMV) by Tuesday, October 14, 2014.

If you register to vote online, your registration must be submitted by 11:59pm on Tuesday, October 14, 2014.

What information is required to register?

To complete your registration you will provide your:

- full legal name
- home address
- date of birth
- signature
- valid identification

What are the identification requirements?

1. If you have a current, valid Driver's License, Permit or ID number issued by the State of Oregon Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), you must provide it in the boxes on the card.

A suspended Driver's License is still valid; a revoked Driver's License is NOT valid.

2. If you do not have a current, valid Driver's License, Permit or ID number issued by the State of Oregon Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), you must affirm this on the card by marking the appropriate circle and you must then provide the last four digits of your Social Security number.
3. If you do not have a Social Security number, you must affirm this on the card by marking the circle in indicating you do not have a valid Driver's License or Social Security number.
4. If you do not have a Driver's License, Permit, ID number, or a Social Security number, and you are registering by mail, you must provide a copy of one of the following which shows the voter's name and current address:
 - valid photo identification
 - a paycheck stub
 - a utility bill
 - a bank statement
 - a government document
 - proof of eligibility under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) or the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (VAEH)

If you do not provide valid identification, you will not be eligible to vote for Federal races. You will, however, still be eligible to vote for state and local contests.

Updating your voter registration

Once you have registered, you are responsible for keeping your information up to date. You can do this online at www.oregonvotes.gov or by completing and returning a voter registration card with the new information. You should update your registration if you do any of the following:

- change your home address
- change your mailing address
- change your name
- change your signature
- want to change or select a political party
- will be away from home on election day

If you notify your county elections office of your change of residence address after October 30, 2014, you must request that a ballot be mailed to you or go to your county elections office to get your ballot.



Use online voter resources to register or update your registration status, **oregonvotes.gov**

qualifications

Are you a citizen of the United States of America? yes no

Are you at least 17 years of age? yes no

If you mark no in response to either of these questions, do not complete this form.

personal information *required information

last name* first* middle

Oregon residence address (include apt. or space number)* city* zip code*

date of birth (month/day/year)* county of residence

phone email

mailing address (required if different than residence) city/state zip code

Oregon Driver's License/ID number

Provide a valid **Oregon Driver's License, Permit or ID:**

I do not have a valid **Oregon Driver's License/Permit/ID**
The last 4 digits of my Social Security Number (SSN) are:

x x x - x x -

I do not have a valid Oregon Driver's License/Permit/ID or a SSN. I have attached a copy of **acceptable identification**.

political party

- Not a member of a party
- Americans Elect
- Constitution
- Democratic
- Independent
- Libertarian
- Pacific Green
- Progressive
- Republican
- Working Families
- Other _____

signature I swear or affirm that I am qualified to be an elector and I have told the truth on this registration.

sign here _____ date today _____

! If you sign this card and know it to be false, you can be fined up to \$125,000 and/or jailed for up to 5 years.

registration updates Complete this section if you are updating your information.

previous registration name previous county and state

home address on previous registration date of birth (month/day/year)

Baker

Tamara J. Green
Baker County Clerk
1995 3rd St., Suite 150
Baker City, OR 97814-3398

541-523-8207
TTY 541-523-9538
fax 541-523-8240
tgreen@bakercounty.org

Benton

James Morales
Benton County Clerk
Elections Division
120 NW 4th St., Room 13
Corvallis, OR 97330

541-766-6756
TTY 541-766-6080
fax 541-766-6757
bcelections@co.benton.or.us
www.co.benton.or.us/
elections

Clackamas

Sherry Hall
Clackamas County Clerk
Elections Division
1710 Red Soils Court,
Suite 100
Oregon City, OR 97045

503-655-8510
TTY 503-655-1685
fax 503-655-8461
elections@co.clackamas.or.us
www.clackamas.us/elections

Clatsop

Maeve Kennedy Grimes
Clatsop County Clerk
Elections Division
820 Exchange St.,
Suite 220
Astoria, OR 97103

503-325-8511
fax 503-325-9307
clerk@co.clatsop.or.us
www.co.clatsop.or.us

Columbia

Elizabeth (Betty) Huser
Columbia County Clerk
Courthouse, 230 Strand St.
St. Helens, OR 97051-2089

503-397-7214 or
503-397-3796
TTY 503-397-7246
fax 503-397-7266
Betty.Huser@co.columbia.or.us
www.co.columbia.or.us

Coos

Terri L. Turi, CCC
Coos County Clerk
Courthouse, 250 N. Baxter
Coquille, OR 97423-1899

541-396-7610
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-396-1013
elections@co.coos.or.us
www.co.coos.or.us

Crook

Deanna (Dee) Berman
Crook County Clerk
300 NE Third, Room 23
Prineville, OR 97754-1919

541-447-6553
TTY 541-416-4963
fax 541-416-2145
dee.berman@co.crook.or.us
www.co.crook.or.us

Curry

Reneé Kolen
Curry County Clerk
94235 Moore St.,
Suite 212
Gold Beach, OR 97444

541-247-3297 or
1-877-739-4218
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-247-6440
clerk@co.curry.or.us
www.co.curry.or.us/Clerk

Deschutes

Nancy Blankenship
Deschutes County Clerk
PO Box 6005
Bend, OR 97708-6005

541-388-6547
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-383-4424
elections@deschutes.org
www.deschutes.org

Douglas

Patricia Hitt
Douglas County Clerk
PO Box 10
Roseburg, OR 97470-0004

541-440-4252
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-440-4408
elections@co.douglas.or.us

Gilliam

Rena Kennedy
Gilliam County Clerk
PO Box 427
Condon, OR 97823-0427

541-384-2311
rena.kennedy@
co.gilliam.or.us
www.co.gilliam.or.us

Grant

Brenda Percy
Grant County Clerk
201 S. Humbolt, Suite 290
Canyon City, OR 97820

541-575-1675
TTY 541-575-1675
fax 541-575-2248
percyb@grantcounty-or.gov

Harney

Derrin Robinson
Harney County Clerk
Courthouse,
450 N. Buena Vista #14
Burns, OR 97720

541-573-6641
fax 541-573-8370
derrin.robinson@
co.harney.or.us
www.co.harney.or.us

Hood River

Brian D. Beebe
Director,
Records/Assessment
601 State St.
Hood River, OR 97031-1871

541-386-1442
fax 541-387-6864
elections@co.hood-river.or.us

Jackson

Christine Walker
Jackson County Clerk
1101 W. Main St., Suite 201
Medford, OR 97501-2369

541-774-6148
fax 541-774-6140
walkercd@jacksoncounty.org
www.co.jackson.or.us

Jefferson

Kathy Marston
Jefferson County Clerk
66 SE "D" St., Suite C
Madras, OR 97741

541-475-4451
fax 541-325-5018
kathy.marston@
co.jefferson.or.us

Josephine

Art Harvey
Josephine County Clerk
PO Box 69
Grants Pass, OR 97528-0203

541-474-5243
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 541-474-5246
clerk@co.josephine.or.us

Klamath

Linda Smith
Klamath County Clerk
305 Main St.
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

541-883-5134
fax 541-885-6757
KlamathCountyElections@
Klamathcounty.org
www.klamathcounty.org

Lake

Stacie Geaney
Lake County Clerk
513 Center St.
Lakeview, OR 97630-1539

541-947-6006
fax 541-947-0905
sgeaney@co.lake.or.us

Lane

Cheryl Betschart
Lane County Clerk
275 W. 10th Ave.
Eugene, OR 97401-3008

541-682-4234
fax 541-682-2303
elections.customer@
co.lane.or.us
www.co.lane.or.us/elections

Lincoln

Dana Jenkins
Lincoln County Clerk
225 W. Olive St., Room 201
Newport, OR 97365

541-265-4131
TTY 541-265-4193
fax 541-265-4950
countyclerk@co.lincoln.or.us
www.co.lincoln.or.us/clerk

Linn

Steve Druckenmiller
Linn County Clerk
300 SW 4th Ave.
Albany, OR 97321

541-967-3831
TTY 541-967-3833
fax 541-926-5109
sdruckenmiller@co.linn.or.us

Malheur

Deborah R. DeLong
Malheur County Clerk
251 "B" St. West, Suite 4
Vale, OR 97918

541-473-5151
TTY 541-473-5157
fax 541-473-5523
countyclerk@malheurco.org
www.malheurco.org

Marion

Bill Burgess
Marion County Clerk
555 Court St. NE, Suite 2130
Salem, OR 97301

PO Box 14500
Salem, OR 97309
503-588-5041 or
1-800-655-5388
TTY 503-588-5610
fax 503-588-5383
elections@co.marion.or.us
www.co.marion.or.us/co/
elections

Morrow

Bobbi Childers
Morrow County Clerk
PO Box 338
Heppner, OR 97836-0338
541-676-5604
fax 541-676-9876
bchilders@co.morrow.or.us

Multnomah

Tim Scott
Director of Elections
1040 SE Morrison St.
Portland, OR 97214-2495
503-988-3720
fax 503-988-3719
elections@multco.us
www.mcelections.org

Polk

Valerie Unger
Polk County Clerk
850 Main St.
Dallas, OR 97338-3179
503-623-9217
fax 503-623-0717
unger.valerie@co.polk.or.us
www.co.polk.or.us

Sherman

Jenine McDermid
Sherman County Clerk
500 Court St.
PO Box 365
Moro, OR 97039-0365
541-565-3606
fax 541-565-3771
countyclerk@
shermancounty.net
www.sherman-county.com/
govt_clerk.asp

Tillamook

Tassi O'Neil
Tillamook County Clerk
201 Laurel Ave.
Tillamook, OR 97141

503-842-3402 or
1-800-488-8280 ext. 4000
fax 503-842-1599
clerk@co.tillamook.or.us
www.co.tillamook.or.us

Umatilla

Kim Lindell
Elections Manager
216 SE 4th St.,
Suite 10
Pendleton, OR 97801
541-278-6254
fax 541-278-5467
elections@umatillacounty.net
www.co.umatilla.or.us

Union

Robin Church
Union County Clerk
1001 4th St., Suite D
LaGrande, OR 97850
541-963-1006
fax 541-963-1013
rchurch@union-county.org
www.union-county.org

Wallowa

Dana Roberts
Wallowa County Clerk
101 S. River St., Room 100
Enterprise, OR 97828-1335
541-426-4543 ext. 158
fax 541-426-5901
wcclerk@co.wallowa.or.us
www.co.wallowa.or.us

Wasco

Linda Brown
Wasco County Clerk
511 Washington St.,
Room 201
The Dalles, OR 97058
541-506-2530
fax 541-506-2531
lindab@co.wasco.or.us

Washington

Mickie Kawai
Elections Division
3700 SW Murray Blvd.,
Suite 101
Beaverton, OR 97005

503-846-5800
TTY 503-846-4598
elections@co.washington.or.us
www.co.washington.or.us/
elections

Wheeler

Barbara S. Sitton
Wheeler County Clerk
PO Box 327
Fossil, OR 97830-0327

541-763-2400
TTY 541-763-2401
fax 541-763-2026
bsitton@co.wheeler.or.us

Yamhill

Brian Van Bergen
Yamhill County Clerk
414 NE Evans St.
McMinnville, OR 97128-4607

503-434-7518
TTY 1-800-735-2900
fax 503-434-7520
elections@co.yamhill.or.us
www.co.yamhill.or.us/clerk

Vote by Mail Frequently Asked Questions

As a voter, what do I have to do?

Your ballot packet will automatically be mailed to you between October 15 and October 21, 2014. Inside the packet you will find the ballot, a secrecy envelope and a return envelope. Once you vote the ballot, place it in the secrecy envelope and seal it in the pre-addressed return envelope. Be sure you sign the return envelope on the appropriate line. After that just return the ballot either by mail or at a designated dropsite.

What if I am uncomfortable voting my ballot at home?

There are privacy booths available for you to cast your ballot at your county elections office and there may be others at dropsite locations elsewhere in your county. For further information, call your county elections official.

What if my ballot doesn't come?

If you are registered to vote and have not received your ballot by October 24th, call your county elections office. They will check that your voter registration is current. If it is, they will mail you a replacement ballot. You can also check the status of your ballot at My Vote at www.oregonvotes.gov.

What if I have moved and have not updated my registration?

If you were registered to vote by October 14 but now have a different address, call your county elections office for instructions on how to update your registration and receive a ballot.

Do I have to return my ballot by mail?

You have the choice of mailing your ballot or returning it to any county elections office or any designated official dropsite in the state. You can find your nearest dropsite along with a map of how to get there by going to www.oregonvotes.gov or you may contact your county elections office.

How much postage is required to mail the ballot back?

Your voted ballot can usually be returned using a single 49¢ first-class stamp. In those instances where additional postage is necessary, it will be clearly indicated on the ballot materials.

When must the voted ballot be returned?

The voted ballot must be received in any county elections office or designated dropsite by 8pm on election night. Postmarks do not count!

How do I know if my ballot is received?

You can track the status of your ballot by going online to: My Vote at www.oregonvotes.gov or you can call your county elections office and ask if they received your ballot. A record is kept showing each voter whose ballot has been returned.

Can anyone find out how I've voted once I mail my ballot?

No. All ballots are separated from the return envelope before the ballots are inspected. This process ensures confidentiality.

What if I forget to sign the return envelope?

Your elections office will contact you, if possible, to come to the elections office to sign it.

Can the public watch the election process?

All steps of the process are open to observation by the public. Contact your county elections official to make arrangements.

When will election results be known?

Initial results are released at 8pm election night and will continue to be updated through election night until all ballots have been counted. Final certified results will be available 30 days after the election.

Provisional Ballot Information

You will be issued a provisional ballot if:

- there is a question about your eligibility as a voter (for example, there is no evidence on file that you are an active or inactive voter in Oregon)
- you need to vote at a county elections office in a county other than the one you live in

In order to obtain a provisional ballot, you need to fill out a Provisional Ballot Request Form in person at the county elections office.

Your provisional ballot will not be counted until it is determined that you are eligible to vote.

After you have voted the ballot, you can call 1-866-ORE-VOTE (1-866-673-8683) or the county elections office in which you voted to find out if your ballot was counted. If your ballot was not counted, you can also find out the reason it was not counted.

If it is determined that you are ineligible to vote in this election, the completed Provisional Ballot Request Form will serve as your voter registration for future elections.

How to File a Complaint

Any registered voter may file a written complaint with the Secretary of State alleging that a violation of an election law or rule adopted by the Secretary of State has occurred. The complaint should state the reason for believing that the violation occurred and provide evidence relating to it. The complaint must be signed by the elector; anonymous complaints will not be accepted. The complaint should be mailed to, or filed at:

Secretary of State, Elections Division
255 Capitol St NE, Suite 501
Salem, OR 97310

Name	Page
Auer, Aaron	12
Barnhart, Phil	16
Beilstein, Mike	11
Beyer, Lee	14
Clausen, Jim	21
Close, Betsy L	15
DeFazio, Peter A	10
Delsman, David E	20
Gelser, Sara A	15
Harisay, Rich	18
Kitzhaber, John	13
Konopa, Sharon	21
Kopczynski, Ray	22
Lindsey, John	19
Lugo, Christina Jean	9
Merkley, Jeff	8
Montchalin, Mike	8
Olsen, Dick	22
Olson, Andy	17
Petersen, Andy	16
Richardson, Dennis	12
Riley, Bruce	20
Robinson, Art	10
Spasaro, Michael P	14
Sprenger, Sherrie	18
Wehby, Monica	9

Secretary of State

Kate Brown
State Capitol
Salem, OR 97310-0722

NONPROFIT
CAR-RT SORT
U.S. Postage
PAID
Portland, OR
Permit No. 815



Residential Customer

vote!



Voters' Pamphlet
Oregon General Election
November 4, 2014

7 Linn